arXiv:1002.1684v2 [math.RT] 22 Feb 2010

Locally simple subalgebras of diagonal Lie algebras

Sergei Markouski

Abstract

We describe, up to isomorphism, all locally simple subalgebras of any diagonal locally simple Lie algebra.

Key words (2010 MSC): 17B05 and 17B65.

1 Introduction

A Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is *locally finite* if any finite subset S of $\mathfrak{g}$ is contained in a finite-dimensional Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}(S)$ of $\mathfrak{g}$. If, for any S, $\mathfrak{g}(S)$ can be chosen simple (semisimple), $\mathfrak{g}$ is called *locally simple (semisimple).* In 1998, A. Baranov introduced the class of diagonal locally finite Lie algebras and established their general properties, see [B1], [B2]. Moreover, an explicit description of the more special class of diagonal locally simple Lie algebras was obtained by A. Baranov and A. Zhilinskii in [BZ], where they classified diagonal direct limits of simple complex Lie algebras up to isomorphism. In the present paper we work with the latter class of Lie algebras, and throughout the paper a diagonal Lie algebra will be assumed locally simple. Particular examples of such algebras are the classical infinite-dimensional complex Lie algebras $\mathrm{sl}(\infty)$, $\mathrm{so}(\infty)$, and $\mathrm{sp}(\infty)$, which can be defined as the unions $\cup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_{>1}}\mathrm{sl}(i)$, $\cup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_{>1}}\mathrm{o}(i)$, and $\cup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_{>1}}\mathrm{sp}(2i)$, respectively, for any inclusions $\mathrm{sl}(i)\subset\mathrm{sl}(i+1)$, $\mathrm{o}(i)\subset\mathrm{o}(i+1)$, and $\mathrm{sp}(2i)\subset\mathrm{sp}(2i+2)$, $i>1$. Moreover, the latter Lie algebras are the only countable-dimensional finitary locally simple complex Lie algebras, see [B3], [B4], [BS].

The semisimple subalgebras of semisimple finite-dimensional complex Lie algebras were described by A. Malcev and E. Dynkin more than half a century ago [M], [D]. Recently, I. Dimitrov and I. Penkov characterized all locally semisimple subalgebras of $\mathrm{sl}(\infty)$, $\mathrm{so}(\infty)$, and $\mathrm{sp}(\infty)$ [DP]. The same problem is of interest for the more general class of diagonal Lie algebras. It makes sense to first restrict the problem to describing, up to isomorphism, all locally simple subalgebras of diagonal Lie algebras. The purpose of this paper is to present a solution of the latter problem.

2 Preliminaries

The base field is $\mathbb{C}$. We assume that all Lie algebras considered are finite dimensional or countable dimensional. When considering classical simple Lie algebras, we consider the three types A, C, and O, where O stands for both types B and D.

A classical simple Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}_1$ of a finite-dimensional classical simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_2$ is called *diagonal* if there is an isomorphism of $\mathfrak{g}_1$-modules

$$V_2\downarrow\mathfrak{g}_1\cong\underbrace{V_1\oplus\ldots\oplus V_1}_{l}\oplus\underbrace{V_1^*\oplus\ldots\oplus V_1^*}_{r}\oplus\underbrace{T_1\oplus\ldots\oplus T_1}_{z},$$

where V_i is the natural $\mathfrak{g}_i$-module ($i=1,2$), V_1^* is the dual of V_1, and T_1 is the one-dimensional trivial $\mathfrak{g}_1$-module. The triple (l,r,z) is called the *signature* of $\mathfrak{g}_1$ in $\mathfrak{g}_2$. An injective homomorphism $\varepsilon:\mathfrak{g}_1\to\mathfrak{g}_2$ is *diagonal* if $\varepsilon(\mathfrak{g}_1)$ is a diagonal subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}_2$. The *signature* of ε is by definition the signature of $\varepsilon(\mathfrak{g}_1)$ in $\mathfrak{g}_2$.

An *exhaustion*

$$\mathfrak{g}_1\subset\mathfrak{g}_2\subset\cdots$$

of a locally finite Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is a direct system of finite-dimensional Lie subalgebras of $\mathfrak{g}$ such that the direct limit Lie algebra $\varinjlim\mathfrak{g}_n$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{g}$. A locally simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{s}$ is *diagonal* if it admits an exhaustion by simple subalgebras $\mathfrak{s}_i$ such that all inclusions $\mathfrak{s}_i\subset\mathfrak{s}_{i+1}$ are diagonal.

The following result is due to A. Baranov.

Proposition 2.1. *Any locally simple subalgebra of a diagonal Lie algebra is diagonal.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a locally simple subalgebra of a diagonal Lie algebra $\mathfrak{s}'$. Corollary 5.11 in [B1] claims that a locally simple Lie algebra is diagonal if and only if it admits an injective homomorphism into a Lie algebra associated with some locally finite associative algebra. Hence $\mathfrak{s}'$ admits an injective homomorphism into a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ associated with some locally finite associative algebra. Then there is an injective homomorphism $\mathfrak{s} \to \mathfrak{s}' \to \mathfrak{g}$, so $\mathfrak{s}$ is diagonal. □

This result reduces the study of locally simple subalgebras of diagonal Lie algebras to the study of diagonal subalgebras.

Next we introduce the notion of index of a simple subalgebra in a simple Lie algebra. This notion goes back to E. Dynkin [D]. For a simple finite-dimensional Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ we denote by $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$ the invariant non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form on $\mathfrak{g}$ normalized so that $\langle \alpha, \alpha^\vee\rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} = 2$ for any long root α of $\mathfrak{g}$. If $\varphi : \mathfrak{s} \to \mathfrak{g}$ is an injective homomorphism of simple Lie algebras, then $\langle x, y\rangle_\varphi := \langle \varphi(x), \varphi(y)\rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is an invariant non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form on $\mathfrak{s}$. Consequently,

$$\langle x, y\rangle_\varphi = I^{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathfrak{s}}(\varphi)\langle x, y\rangle_{\mathfrak{s}}$$

for some scalar $I^{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathfrak{s}}(\varphi)$. By definition $I^{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathfrak{s}}(\varphi)$ is the *index* of $\mathfrak{s}$ in $\mathfrak{g}$. If φ is clear from the context, we will simply write $I^{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathfrak{s}}$. If U is any finite-dimensional $\mathfrak{s}$-module, then the *index* $I_{\mathfrak{s}}(U)$ of U is defined as $I^{\mathrm{sl}(U)}_{\mathfrak{s}}$, where $\mathfrak{s}$ is mapped into $\mathrm{sl}(U)$ through the module U. The following properties of the index are established in [D].

Proposition 2.2. *(i)* $I^{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathfrak{s}} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

(ii) $I^{\mathfrak{k}}_{\mathfrak{s}} I^{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathfrak{k}} = I^{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

(iii) $I_{\mathfrak{s}}(U_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus U_n) = I_{\mathfrak{s}}(U_1) + \cdots + I_{\mathfrak{s}}(U_n)$.

(iv) If U is an $\mathfrak{s}$-module with highest weight λ (with respect to some Borel subalgebra), then $I_{\mathfrak{s}}(U) = \frac{\dim U}{\dim \mathfrak{s}}\langle \lambda, \lambda + 2\rho\rangle_{\mathfrak{s}}$*, where 2ρ is the sum of all the positive roots of $\mathfrak{s}$.*

Corollary 2.3. *Let $\mathfrak{s}$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ be finite-dimensional classical simple Lie algebras of the same type (A, C, or O). If $\mathfrak{s}$ is a diagonal subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ of signature (l, r, z), then $I^{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathfrak{s}}(\varepsilon) = l + r$.*

Proof. Indeed, if V is the natural $\mathfrak{s}$-module then clearly $I_{\mathfrak{s}}(V) = I_{\mathfrak{s}}(V^*)$, and (iii) implies the result for type A algebras. If $\mathfrak{s}$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ are of type O or C then the result follows from the observation in [DP] that $I^{\mathrm{sp}(U)}_{\mathfrak{s}} = I_{\mathfrak{s}}(U)$ and $I^{\mathrm{so}(U)}_{\mathfrak{s}} = \frac{1}{2}I_{\mathfrak{s}}(U)$ when U admits a corresponding invariant form. This latter observation is also a corollary from [D]. □

Let us now recall several notions introduced by Baranov and Zhilinskii, and state the main result of [BZ], namely the classification of diagonal Lie algebras.

Let $p_1 = 2, p_2 = 3, \ldots$ be the increasing sequence of all prime numbers. A map from the set $\{p_1, p_2, \ldots\}$ into the set $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots\} \bigcup \{\infty\}$ is called a *Steinitz number.* The Steinitz number which has value α_1 at p_1, α_2 at p_2, etc. will be denoted by $p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots$. Let $\Pi = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots$ and $\Pi' = p_1^{\alpha'_1} p_2^{\alpha'_2} \cdots$ be two Steinitz numbers. We put $\Pi\,\Pi' = p_1^{\alpha_1+\alpha'_1} p_2^{\alpha_2+\alpha'_2} \cdots$, and we say that Π *divides* Π' (or $\Pi | \Pi'$) if and only if $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha'_1$, $\alpha_2 \leq \alpha'_2, \ldots$. In the latter case we write $\div(\Pi', \Pi) = p_1^{\alpha'_1-\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha'_2-\alpha_2} \cdots$, where by convention $p_i^{\infty-\infty} = 1$ for any i. We also define the greatest common divisor $\mathrm{GCD}(\Pi, \Pi')$ as $p_1^{\min(\alpha_1,\alpha'_1)} p_2^{\min(\alpha_2,\alpha'_2)} \cdots$.

Let $q \in \mathbb{Q}$. We write $\Pi = q\Pi'$ (or $q \in \frac{\Pi}{\Pi'}$) if there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $nq \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n\Pi = nq\Pi'$. If there exists $0 \neq q \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\Pi = q\Pi'$, then we say that Π and Π' are $\mathbb{Q}$-*equivalent* and denote this relation by $\Pi \overset{\mathbb{Q}}{\sim} \Pi'$. Suppose $q \in \frac{\Pi}{\Pi'}$ for some $0 \neq q \in \mathbb{Q}$. If p^∞ divides Π, then p^∞ also divides Π' and so $\Pi = qp^k\Pi'$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence in this case $\{qp^k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is a subset of $\frac{\Pi}{\Pi'}$ in our notation. On the other hand, if there is no prime p with p^∞ dividing Π, then the set $\frac{\Pi}{\Pi'}$ consists of the only element q. If $\mathcal{S} = (s_1, s_2, \ldots)$ is a sequence of positive integers, $\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S})$ denotes the infinite product $\prod_{i=1}^{\infty} s_i$ considered as a Steinitz number.

Let $\mathfrak{s}$ be an infinite-dimensional diagonal Lie algebra, so there is an exhaustion $\mathfrak{s} = \cup_i \mathfrak{s}_i$ with all inclusions $\mathfrak{s}_i \subset \mathfrak{s}_{i+1}$ being diagonal. Without loss of generality we may assume that all $\mathfrak{s}_i$ are of the same type X ($X = A$, C, or O), and we say that $\mathfrak{s}$ is of type X. Note that a diagonal Lie algebra can be of more than one type. The triple (l_i, r_i, z_i) denotes the signature of the homomorphism $\mathfrak{s}_i \to \mathfrak{s}_{i+1}$ and n_i denotes the dimension of the natural $\mathfrak{s}_i$-module. We assume that $r_i = 0$ if X is not A (for all classical Lie algebras of type other than A the natural representation is isomorphic to its dual). We also assume that $l_i \geq r_i$ for all i for type A algebras. (This does not restrict generality as one can apply outer automorphisms to a suitable subexhaustion if necessary.) Finally, if not stated otherwise, we assume that $n_1 = 1$, $l_1 = n_2$, $r_1 = z_1 = 0$. Denote by $\mathcal{T}$ the sequence of all such triples $\{(l_i, r_i, z_i)\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$. We will write $\mathfrak{s} = X(\mathcal{T})$ which make sense up to isomorphism.

Set $s_i = l_i + r_i$, $c_i = l_i - r_i$ $(i \geq 1)$, $\mathcal{S} = (s_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, $\mathcal{C} = (c_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$. Put $\delta_i = \frac{s_1\cdots s_{n-1}}{n_i}$. Then $\delta_{i+1} = \frac{s_1\cdots s_n}{n_{i+1}} = \frac{s_1\cdots s_{n-1}}{n_i+(z_i/s_i)} \leq \delta_i$. The limit $\delta = \lim\limits_{i\to\infty} \delta_i$ is called the *density index* of $\mathcal{T}$ and is denoted by $\delta(\mathcal{T})$. Since $\delta_2 = s_1/n_2 = 1$, we have $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$. If $\delta = 0$ then the sequence of triples $\mathcal{T}$ is called *sparse.* If there exists i such that $\delta_j = \delta_i \neq 0$ for all $j > i$, the sequence is called *pure.* We say that $\mathcal{T}$ is *dense* if $0 < \delta < \delta_i$ for all i.

If there exists i such that $c_j = s_j$ for all $j \geq i$, then $\mathcal{T}$ is called *one-sided* (in which case we can and will assume that $c_j = s_j$ for all $j \geq 1$). Otherwise it is called *two-sided.* If, for each i, there exists $j > i$ such that $c_j = 0$, then $\mathcal{T}$ is called *symmetric.* Otherwise it is called *non-symmetric.* In the latter case we will assume that $c_i > 0$ for all $i \geq 1$. Set $\sigma_i = \frac{c_1\cdots c_i}{s_1\cdots s_i}$. The limit $\sigma = \lim\limits_{i\to\infty} \sigma_i$ is called the *symmetry index* of $\mathcal{T}$ and is denoted by $\sigma(\mathcal{T})$. Observe that $0 \leq \sigma \leq 1$. Two-sided non-symmetric sequences $\mathcal{T}$ with $\sigma(\mathcal{T}) = 0$ are called *weakly non-symmetric*, and those with $\sigma(\mathcal{T}) \neq 0$ are called *strongly non-symmetric.*

The classification of the infinite-dimensional diagonal locally simple Lie algebras is given by the following two theorems.

Theorem 2.4. *[BZ] Let $X = A$, C, or O. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{(l_i, r_i, z_i)\}$ and $\mathcal{T}' = \{(l'_i, r'_i, z'_i)\}$, where $r_i = r'_i = 0$ if $X \neq A$. Set $\delta = \delta(\mathcal{T})$, $\sigma = \sigma(\mathcal{T})$, $\delta' = \delta(\mathcal{T}')$, $\sigma' = \sigma(\mathcal{T}')$. Then $X(\mathcal{T}) \cong X(\mathcal{T}')$ if and only if the following conditions hold.*

$(\mathcal{A}_1)$ The sequences $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$ have the same density type.

$(\mathcal{A}_2)$ $\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}) \overset{\mathbb{Q}}{\sim} \mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}')$.

$(\mathcal{A}_3)$ $\frac{\delta}{\delta'} \in \frac{\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S})}{\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}')}$ for dense and pure sequences.

$(\mathcal{B}_1)$ The sequences $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$ have the same symmetry type.

$(\mathcal{B}_2)$ $\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{C}) \overset{\mathbb{Q}}{\sim} \mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{C}')$ for two-sided non-symmetric sequences.

$(\mathcal{B}_3)$ There exists $\alpha \in \frac{\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S})}{\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}')}$ such that $\alpha\frac{\sigma}{\sigma'} \in \frac{\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{C})}{\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{C}')}$ for two-sided strongly non-symmetric sequences. Moreover, $\alpha = \frac{\delta}{\delta'}$ if in addition the triple sequences are dense or pure.

Theorem 2.5. *[BZ] Let $\mathcal{T} = \{(l_i, r_i, z_i)\}$, $\mathcal{T}' = \{(l'_i, 0, z'_i)\}$, and $\mathcal{T}'' = \{(l''_i, 0, z''_i)\}$.*

(i) $A(\mathcal{T}) \cong O(\mathcal{T}')$ (resp., $A(\mathcal{T}) \cong C(\mathcal{T}')$) if and only if $\mathcal{T}$ is two-sided symmetric, 2^∞ divides $\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}')$, and the conditions $(\mathcal{A}_1)$, $(\mathcal{A}_2)$, $(\mathcal{A}_3)$ of Theorem 2.4 hold.

(ii) $O(\mathcal{T}') \cong C(\mathcal{T}'')$ if and only if 2^∞ divides both $\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}')$, and $\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}'')$, and the conditions $(\mathcal{A}_1)$, $(\mathcal{A}_2)$, $(\mathcal{A}_3)$ of Theorem 2.4 hold.

Remark. It is easy to see from Theorem 2.4 that a diagonal Lie algebra $X(\mathcal{T})$ is finitary (i.e. isomorphic to $\mathrm{sl}(\infty)$, $\mathrm{so}(\infty)$, or $\mathrm{sp}(\infty)$) if and only if $\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S})$ is finite.

As we see from the above classification, the density type and the symmetry type are well-defined for a diagonal Lie algebra. We will call an algebra *pure*, *dense*, or *sparse* if its sequence of triples $\mathcal{T}$ can be chosen pure, dense, or sparse, respectively. We will also call an algebra *one-sided*, *two-sided symmetric*, *two-sided strongly non-symmetric*, or *two-sided weakly non-symmetric* if its sequence of triples $\mathcal{T}$ can be chosen with the respective property.

For an arbitrary sequence $\mathcal{S} = \{s_i\}_{i\geq 1}$ by $\mathrm{sl}(\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}))$ (respectively, $\mathrm{so}(\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}))$, $\mathrm{sp}(\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}))$) we will denote the pure Lie algebra $A(\{(s_i, 0, 0)\}_{i\geq 1})$ (resp., $O(\{(s_i, 0, 0)\}_{i\geq 1})$, $C(\{(s_i, 0, 0)\}_{i\geq 1})$).

We need two branching rules for Lie algebras of type A. Throughout this paper F_n^λ denotes an irreducible $\mathrm{sl}(n)$-module with highest weight $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n)$, $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Note that the isomorphism class of F_n^λ is determined by the differences $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_{n-1} - \lambda_n$.

Theorem 2.6. *(Gelfand-Tsetlin rule [Z]) Consider a subalgebra $\mathrm{sl}(n) \subset \mathrm{sl}(n+1)$ of signature $(1, 0, 1)$. Then, there is an isomorphism of $\mathrm{sl}(n)$-modules*

$$F_{n+1}^\lambda \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n) \cong \bigoplus_\mu F_n^\mu, \tag{1}$$

where the summation runs over all integral weights $\mu = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n)$ satisfying $\lambda_1 \geq \mu_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \mu_n \geq \lambda_{n+1}$.

Consider the $\mathrm{sl}(n) \oplus \mathrm{sl}(n)$-module $F_n^\mu \otimes F_n^\nu$. By Theorem 2.1.1 of [HTW] its restriction to $\mathrm{sl}(n) := \{x \oplus x,\ x \in \mathrm{sl}(n)\}$ decomposes as $\bigoplus\limits_\lambda c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda F_n^\lambda$, where $c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ is the Littlewood-Richardson coefficient. One can iterate this branching rule to obtain the decomposition for higher tensor products. Let $c_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_k}^\lambda$ denote the coefficient obtained in this manner, so,

$$F_n^{\mu_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes F_n^{\mu_k} \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n) \cong \bigoplus_\lambda c_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_k}^\lambda F_n^\lambda, \tag{2}$$

where the summation runs over all integral dominant weights λ with $\lambda_i \geq 0$. We will call the numbers $c^{\lambda}_{\mu_1 \ldots \mu_k}$ *generalized Littlewood-Richardson coefficients.*

The following branching rule was communicated to us by J. Willenbring.

Proposition 2.7. *Consider a diagonal subalgebra* $\mathrm{sl}(n) \subset \mathrm{sl}(kn)$ *of signature* $(k, 0, 0)$*. Then, there is an isomorphism of* $\mathrm{sl}(n)$*-modules*

$$F^{\lambda}_{kn} \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n) \cong \bigoplus_{\nu} \Big(\sum_{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k} c^{\lambda}_{\mu_1 \ldots \mu_k} c^{\nu}_{\mu_1 \ldots \mu_k} \Big) F^{\nu}_n, \tag{3}$$

where one summation runs over all integral dominant weights ν *with* $\nu_i \geq 0$ *for all* i *and the other summation runs over all sets of integral dominant weights* $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k$ *with* $(\mu_j)_i \geq 0$ *for all* i, j*.*

Proof. Consider the block-diagonal subalgebra $\mathrm{sl}(l) \oplus \mathrm{sl}(m) \subset \mathrm{sl}(n)$ $(n = l + m)$. By Theorem 2.2.1 of [HTW] $F^{\lambda}_n \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(l) \oplus \mathrm{sl}(m)$ decomposes as $\bigoplus_{\mu\nu} c^{\lambda}_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu}_l \otimes F^{\nu}_m$. Let now the direct sum of k copies of $\mathrm{sl}(n)$ be a subalgebra $\mathrm{sl}(kn)$ with block diagonal inclusion. By iteration of this branching rule we see that the decomposition of $F^{\lambda}_{kn} \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n) \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathrm{sl}(n)$ is determined by the generalized Littlewood-Richardson coefficients:

$$F^{\lambda}_{kn} \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n) \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathrm{sl}(n) \cong \bigoplus_{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_k} c^{\lambda}_{\mu_1 \ldots \mu_k} F^{\mu_1}_n \otimes \cdots \otimes F^{\mu_k}_n, \tag{4}$$

where $sl(n) \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathrm{sl}(n)$ is the block-diagonal subalgebra of $\mathrm{sl}(kn)$, and the summation runs over all integral dominant weights $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k$ with $(\mu_j)_i \geq 0$.

Consider now a subalgebra $\mathrm{sl}(n) \subset \mathrm{sl}(kn)$ of signature $(k, 0, 0)$. One can obtain (3) as a combination of the two branching rules (2) and (4). ☐

Remark. In Proposition 2.7 the sum is taken over all integral dominant weights ν with $\nu_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for all i. In order for F^{ν}_n to have a non-zero coefficient in (3) both Littlewood-Richardson coefficients $c^{\lambda}_{\mu_1 \ldots \mu_k}$ and $c^{\nu}_{\mu_1 \ldots \mu_k}$ must be non-zero for some $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k$. But for that we must have $\sum_{i=1}^{kn} \lambda_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \nu_i$. Therefore the summation in (3) may be taken to run over only those weights ν with fixed $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \nu_i$. Hence all modules F^{ν}_n which are present in (3) with non-zero coefficients are pairwise non-isomorphic. Indeed, if $F^{\nu'}_n \cong F^{\nu}_n$ both have non-zero coefficients in (3), then the weight ν' can be obtained by shifting the weight ν by an integer, so $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \nu_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \nu'_i$ implies $\nu' = \nu$. This argument allows us to refer to a non-zero coefficient $(\sum_{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k} c^{\lambda}_{\mu_1 \ldots \mu_k} c^{\nu}_{\mu_1 \ldots \mu_k})$ as the multiplicity of F^{ν}_n in (3).

Corollary 2.8. *For a diagonal subalgebra* $\mathrm{sl}(n) \subset \mathrm{sl}(kn)$ *of signature* $(k, 0, 0)$ *the restriction* $F^{\lambda}_{kn} \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n)$ *has a submodule with highest weight*

$$(\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_n) = (\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_k, \lambda_{k+1} + \cdots + \lambda_{2k}, \ldots, \lambda_{kn-k+1} + \cdots + \lambda_{kn}).$$

Proof. Indeed, if we set $\mu_i = (\lambda_i, \lambda_{k+i}, \ldots, \lambda_{kn-k+i})$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, then it easy to check that both coefficients $c^{\lambda}_{\mu_1 \ldots \mu_k}$ and $c^{\nu}_{\mu_1 \ldots \mu_k}$ are non-zero, and therefore the highest weight module F^{ν}_n is present in (3) with non-zero multiplicity. ☐

If $\mathfrak{s}$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ are two diagonal Lie algebras, then constructing a homomorphism $\theta : \mathfrak{s} \to \mathfrak{g}$ is equivalent to constructing commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathfrak{s}_1 \arrow[r, "\varphi_1"] \arrow[d, "\theta_1"'] & \mathfrak{s}_2 \arrow[r, "\varphi_2"] \arrow[d, "\theta_2"'] & \cdots \\
\mathfrak{g}_1 \arrow[r, "\psi_1"] & \mathfrak{g}_2 \arrow[r, "\psi_2"] & \cdots
\end{tikzcd} \tag{5}$$

for some exhaustions $\mathfrak{s}_1 \overset{\varphi_1}{\to} \mathfrak{s}_2 \overset{\varphi_2}{\to} \ldots$ and $\mathfrak{g}_1 \overset{\psi_1}{\to} \mathfrak{g}_2 \overset{\psi_2}{\to} \ldots$ of $\mathfrak{s}$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ respectively. An injective homomorphism θ is called *diagonal* if all θ_i can be chosen diagonal for sufficiently large i.

To deal with diagonal homomorphisms we will need the following result.

Lemma 2.9. *Let* $\varepsilon_1 : \mathfrak{s}_1 \to \mathfrak{s}_2$ *and* $\varepsilon_2 : \mathfrak{s}_1 \to \mathfrak{g}$ *be diagonal injective homomorphisms of finite-dimensional simple classical Lie algebras of signatures* (l, r, z) *and* (p, q, u) *respectively. Let a triple of non-negative integers* (p', q', u') *satisfy the following conditions:*

$$p + q = (l + r)(p' + q'),\ p - q = (l - r)(p' - q'),\ n = n_2(p' + q') + u',$$

where n and n_2 are the dimensions of the natural $\mathfrak{g}$- and $\mathfrak{s}_2$-modules respectively. Then, under the assumption that $\mathfrak{s}_2$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ are of the same type X, there exists a diagonal injective homomorphism $\theta : \mathfrak{s}_2 \to \mathfrak{g}$ of signature (p', q', u') such that $\varepsilon_2 = \theta \circ \varepsilon_1$. If $\mathfrak{s}_2$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ are of different types X and Y, the statement holds under the following additional conditions on the triple (p', q', u'):

$$p' = q' \text{ if } (X, Y) = (A, O) \text{ or } (X, Y) = (A, C);$$
$$p' \text{ is even if } (X, Y) = (O, C) \text{ or } (X, Y) = (C, O).$$

Proof. Lemma 2.6 in [BZ] states the same result in case all Lie algebras $\mathfrak{s}_1$, $\mathfrak{s}_2$, $\mathfrak{g}$ are of the same type. The proof of Lemma 2.6 in [BZ] works also when the three algebras are not of the same type, but only if $\mathfrak{s}_2$ can be mapped into $\mathfrak{g}$ by an injective homomorphism of signature (p', q', u'). It is easy to check that the additional conditions guarantee the existence of such a homomorphism. □

Consider the diagram in (5) without the commutativity assumption. Lemma 2.9 implies that if all θ_i are diagonal injective homomorphism such that for all $i \geq 1$ the two diagonal injective homomorphisms $\psi_i \circ \theta_i$ and $\theta_{i+1} \circ \varphi_i$ of $\mathfrak{s}_i$ into $\mathfrak{g}_{i+1}$ have the same signature, then there are diagonal injective homomorphisms θ_i' with the same property making the diagram commutative. Later on in this paper when constructing diagrams as in (5) in concrete situations, we will check commutativity by showing only that the signatures of $\psi_i \circ \theta_i$ and $\theta_{i+1} \circ \varphi_i$ coincide for all $i \geq 1$. It will then be assumed that θ_i are replaced by corresponding diagonal injective homomorphisms θ_i' making the diagram commute.

The following result can be found in [BZ] (see also all references in there, for instance [B2]).

Lemma 2.10. *Let $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{s}$ be finite-dimensional classical simple Lie algebras,* $\operatorname{rk} \mathfrak{h} > 10$*. Assume that the inclusion $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{s}$ is diagonal. Then the inclusions $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{s}$ are also diagonal.*

Corollary 2.11. *Let $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{s}$ be infinite-dimensional diagonal Lie algebras. Assume that the inclusion $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{s}$ is diagonal. Then the inclusions $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{s}$ are also diagonal.*

We conclude this section by introducing a notion of equivalence of infinite-dimensional Lie algebras. We say that $\mathfrak{g}_1$ is *equivalent* to $\mathfrak{g}_2$ ($\mathfrak{g}_1 \sim \mathfrak{g}_2$) if there exist injective homomorphisms $\mathfrak{g}_1 \to \mathfrak{g}_2$ and $\mathfrak{g}_2 \to \mathfrak{g}_1$. For finite-dimensional Lie algebras this equivalence relation is the same as isomorphism, but this is no longer the case for infinite-dimensional Lie algebras.

3 Classification of locally simple subalgebras of diagonal Lie algebras

In this section all diagonal Lie algebras considered are assumed to be infinite dimensional.

We start the classification by asking whether $\mathrm{sl}(\infty)$ admits an injective homomorphism into any non-finitary diagonal Lie algebra. As it turns out, the most basic example sufficed to answer this question, as we were able to construct an injective homomorphism of $\mathrm{sl}(\infty)$ into $\mathrm{sl}(2^\infty)$, so the answer is yes. The following construction was suggested to us by I. Dimitrov.

Let F_n be the natural representation of $\mathrm{sl}(n)$. Note that under the injective homomorphism $\mathrm{sl}(n) \to \mathrm{sl}(n+1)$ of signature $(1, 0, 1)$, the exterior algebra $\bigwedge^{\cdot}(F_{n+1})$ decomposes as two copies of $\bigwedge^{\cdot}(F_n)$ as an $\mathrm{sl}(n)$-module. Fix a map $\theta_n : \mathrm{sl}(n) \to \mathrm{sl}(2^n)$ such that the natural representation of $\mathrm{sl}(2^n)$ decomposes as $\bigwedge^{\cdot}(F_n)$ as an $\mathrm{sl}(n)$-module. Then there exists a map $\theta_{n+1} : \mathrm{sl}(n+1) \to \mathrm{sl}(2^{n+1})$ such that the natural representation of $\mathrm{sl}(2^{n+1})$ decomposes as $\bigwedge^{\cdot}(F_{n+1})$ as an $\mathrm{sl}(n+1)$-module making the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{sl}(2) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_2"'] & \cdots \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(n) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_n"'] & \mathrm{sl}(n+1) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_{n+1}"'] & \cdots \\
\mathrm{sl}(2^2) \arrow[r] & \cdots \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(2^n) \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(2^{n+1}) \arrow[r] & \cdots,
\end{tikzcd} \tag{6}$$

where the lower row consists of injective homomorphisms of signature $(2, 0, 0)$. Therefore by induction, the diagram yields an injective homomorphism of $\mathrm{sl}(\infty)$ into $\mathrm{sl}(2^\infty)$.

We will prove now that similar injective homomorphisms exist in a more general setting. The following result will be used later to prove that in fact any finitary diagonal Lie algebra can be similarly mapped into any diagonal Lie algebra.

Proposition 3.1. $\mathrm{sl}(\infty)$ *admits an injective homomorphism into any pure one-sided Lie algebra $\mathfrak{s}$ of type A.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.4 $\mathfrak{s}$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{sl}(\Pi)$ for some infinite Steinitz number Π. Then it is sufficient to show the existence of a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{sl}(2) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_2"'] & \mathrm{sl}(3) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_3"'] & \cdots \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(k) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_k"'] & \mathrm{sl}(k+1) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_{k+1}"'] & \cdots \\
\mathrm{sl}(n_1n_2) \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(n_1n_2n_3) \arrow[r] & \cdots \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(n_1\cdots n_k) \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(n_1\cdots n_{k+1}) \arrow[r] & \cdots
\end{tikzcd} \tag{7}$$

for suitable $\{n_i\}$, where θ_i are injective homomorphisms and $n_1, n_2, \dots$ are chosen so that $\prod_{i=1}^{\infty} n_i = \Pi$. Indeed, the diagram in (7) yields an injective homomorphism $\mathrm{sl}(\infty) \to \mathrm{sl}(n_1n_2\cdots)$, and $\mathrm{sl}(n_1n_2\cdots)$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{s}$ by Theorem 2.4. We will choose the homomorphisms θ_k so that

$$V_k \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(k) \cong a_0^k \bigwedge^0(F_k) \oplus a_1^k \bigwedge^1(F_k) \oplus \cdots \oplus a_k^k \bigwedge^k(F_k)$$

as $\mathrm{sl}(k)$-modules. Here V_k stands for the natural $\mathrm{sl}(n_1\cdots n_k)$-module, F_k is the natural $\mathrm{sl}(k)$-module and the coefficients a_i^k, $i = 0, \dots, k$ are non-negative integers. The above injective homomorphism of $\mathrm{sl}(\infty)$ into $\mathrm{sl}(2^\infty)$ corresponds to the particular case $n_k = 2$ and $a_i^k = 1$ for all $k \geq 2$, $i = 0, \dots, k$.

We see that if the numbers $\{a_i^k\}$ satisfy the conditions $a_i^k + a_{i+1}^k = n_k a_i^{k-1}$, $k \geq 3$, $i = 0, \dots, k-1$ and $a_0^2 + 2a_1^2 + a_2^2 = n_1n_2$, then the homomorphisms θ_k can be chosen so that the diagram in (7) commutes.

We will add numbers a_0^1, a_1^1, a_0^0 to the set of coefficients $\{a_i^k\}$ and will require $a_0^2 + a_1^2 = n_2a_0^1$, $a_1^2 + a_2^2 = n_2a_1^1$, $a_0^1 + a_1^1 = n_1$, and $a_0^0 = 1$. Then the numbers $\{a_i^k\}$ will form an infinite triangle

$$\begin{matrix} a_0^0 \\ a_0^1\ a_1^1 \\ a_0^2\ a_1^2\ a_2^2 \\ \cdots \end{matrix}$$

such that

$$a_i^k + a_{i+1}^k = n_k a_i^{k-1},\ k \geq 1 \text{ and } a_0^0 = 1. \tag{8}$$

It is enough to prove that a triangle of non-negative integers satisfying (8) exists for a suitable choice of n_i. Set $b_k := \frac{a_{k-1}^k}{n_1\cdots n_k}$ for $k \geq 1$. A simple calculation shows that $a_k^k = n_1\cdots n_k(a_0^0 - b_1 - b_2 - \cdots - b_k)$. Notice that since $a_0^0 = 1$, the numbers $b_1, b_2, \dots$ uniquely determine the entire triangle, as the l^{th} "diagonal" $\{a_k^{k+l}\}_{k\geq 0}$ of the triangle is determined by the previous diagonal $\{a_k^{k+l-1}\}_{k\geq 0}$ and the sequence $n_1, n_2, \dots$.

Now we will find conditions on b_k under which all a_i^k will be non-negative. Since $a_k^{k+1} \geq 0$, the numbers b_k should be non-negative. In order for a_k^k to be non-negative we should have $\sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i < a_0^0$ for all k (since b_i are non-negative, we can rewrite these conditions as $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i \leq 1$). The entries of the diagonal $\{a_k^{k+2}\}_{k\geq 0}$ can be found from (8): $a_k^{k+2} = n_1\cdots n_{k+2}(b_{k+1} - b_{k+2})$ for $k \geq 0$. This requires the sequence $\{b_k - b_{k+1}\}$ to be non-negative. If we set $b_k^{(1)} := b_k - b_{k+1}$ for $k \geq 1$, then in a similar way we obtain $a_k^{k+3} = n_1\cdots n_{k+3}(b_{k+1}^{(1)} - b_{k+2}^{(1)})$. This requires the sequence $\{b_k^{(2)} := b_k^{(1)} - b_{k+1}^{(1)}\}$ to be non-negative. Continuing this procedure, we get $a_k^{k+l} = n_1\cdots n_{k+l}b_{k+1}^{(l-1)}$ for all $l \geq 3$, where by definition $b_k^{(l+1)} = b_k^{(l)} - b_{k+1}^{(l)}$. Now we see that the non-negative integers a_i^k satisfying (8) exist if there exists a non-negative sequence $\{b_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ with $b_k \in \frac{1}{n_1\cdots n_k}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k \leq 1$ such that

$$\text{all iterated sequences of differences } \{b_k^{(l)}\}_{k\geq 1} \text{ are non-negative.} \tag{9}$$

Note that the sequence $\{b_k = \frac{1}{q^k}\}$, $q > 1$ satisfies (9) as $b_k^{(l)} = \frac{1}{q^k}(1 - \frac{1}{q})^l > 0$ for all $k, l \geq 1$. (In the case $n_k = n$ for all k, taking $q = n$ yields an injective homomorphism $\mathrm{sl}(\infty) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{sl}(n^\infty)$.) We will find the desired sequence $\{b_k\}$ as a convergent infinite linear combination of geometric sequences.

Let us put $q = 4$ (the following construction would work for any $q \geq 4$) and let $\Pi = m_1m_2\cdots$. Choose a strictly increasing sequence of integers $\{l_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ so that $l_0 = 0$ and $m_1m_2\cdots m_{l_k} > \frac{(q-1)q^{k^2+1}}{q-2}$ for $k \geq 1$, which is possible as Π is infinite. Take $n_k = m_{l_{k-1}+1}\cdots m_{l_k}$ for $k \geq 1$. Then clearly $n_1n_2\cdots = \Pi$.

Let us now construct the sequence $\{b_k\}$ for the chosen $n_1, n_2, \dots$. For $i \geq 1$ we denote $c_i = 1 + \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon_j}{\frac{1}{q^i}(\frac{1}{q^i} - \frac{1}{q}) \cdots (\frac{1}{q^i} - \frac{1}{q^{i-1}})(\frac{1}{q^i} - \frac{1}{q^{i+1}}) \cdots (\frac{1}{q^i} - \frac{1}{q^j})}$, where the numbers ε_j, satisfying

$$0 \leq \varepsilon_j < \frac{q-2}{(q-1)q^{j^2+1}}, \tag{10}$$

are to be chosen later, and put $b_k = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i \left(\frac{1}{q^i}\right)^k$. We will show that for the numbers ε_j, satisfying (10), the series for c_i converges to a positive number for $i \geq 1$, the series for b_k converges for $k \geq 1$, and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k \leq 1$. Moreover, we will show that by varying ε_j inside corresponding intervals we can make each b_k to be of the form $\frac{1}{n_1 \cdots n_k}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. We will have then $b_k^{(l)} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i \left(\frac{1}{q^i}\right)^k \left(1 - \frac{1}{q^i}\right)^l \geq 0$, so $\{b_k^{(l)}\}$ will be a sequence of non-negative numbers for any l. Hence the final condition in (9) will be satisfied.

As a matter of convenience we denote $q_i = \frac{1}{q^i}$. Then let $c_{ij} = \frac{\varepsilon_j}{q_i(q_i - q_1) \cdots (q_i - q_{i-1})(q_i - q_{i+1}) \cdots (q_i - q_j)}$ for $i \leq j$. We see that $c_i = 1 + \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} c_{ij}$. Let us prove that this series converges absolutely. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
|c_i - 1| &= \left| \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon_j}{(\frac{1}{q^i})^j (1 - q^{i-1}) \cdots (1-q)(1 - \frac{1}{q}) \cdots (1 - \frac{1}{q^{j-i}})} \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon_j}{(\frac{1}{q^i})^j (q^{i-1} - 1) \cdots (q-1)(1 - \frac{1}{q}) \cdots (1 - \frac{1}{q^{j-i}})} \\
&\leq \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon_j q^{ij}}{(1 - \frac{1}{q})(1 - \frac{1}{q^2}) \cdots} \leq \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon_j q^{ij}}{(1 - \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{q^2} - \cdots)} = \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon_j q^{ij}(q-1)}{q-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, using (10), we obtain $|c_i - 1| \leq \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \frac{q^{ij}}{q^{j^2+1}} = \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q^{i+2}} + \frac{1}{q^{2i+5}} + \cdots < \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q^2} + \cdots = \frac{1}{q-1}$. Thus, the series $1 + \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} c_{ij}$ converges absolutely and its sum c_i is a number from the interval $\left(\frac{q-2}{q-1}, \frac{q}{q-1}\right)$ (in particular, c_i is positive) for all i. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_i}{q^i} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_i}{(q^2)^i} + \cdots < \frac{q}{q-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{q^i} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(q^2)^i} + \cdots \right) \\
&= \frac{q}{q-1} \left(\frac{1}{q-1} + \frac{1}{q^2-1} + \frac{1}{q^3-1} + \cdots \right) \\
&< \frac{q}{q-1} \left(\frac{1}{q-1} + \frac{1}{(q-1)^2} + \cdots \right) = \frac{q}{q-1} \cdot \frac{1}{q-2} < 1 \text{ because } q \geq 4.
\end{aligned}$$

Since every term in these expressions is non-negative, the convergence of each series $b_k = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i \left(\frac{1}{q^i}\right)^k$ follows.

Finally, let us show that the numbers ε_j, satisfying (10), can be chosen so that $b_k \in \frac{1}{n_1 \cdots n_k}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. We know that $b_k = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i q_i^k = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} q_i^k + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} c_{ij} q_i^k$. From what we proved it follows that the latter sum is absolutely convergent. Therefore we can rewrite it as $b_k = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} q_i^k + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{j} c_{ij} q_i^k$. Note that the numbers c_{ij} were defined as solutions of the equation $\begin{pmatrix} q_1 & \dots & q_j \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ q_1^{j-1} & \dots & q_j^{j-1} \\ q_1^j & \dots & q_j^j \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{1j} \\ \vdots \\ c_{jj} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ \varepsilon_j \end{pmatrix}$ using the well-known formula for inverting a Vandermonde matrix. Thus, $\sum_{i=1}^{j} q_i^k c_{ij} = 0$ for $k < j$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{j} q_i^j c_{ij} = \varepsilon_j$.

Hence, $b_k = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} q_i^k + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\sum_{i=1}^{j} c_{ij} q_i^k + \varepsilon_k$, so $b_k - \varepsilon_k$ depends only on $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{k-1}$. Let us introduce the notation $f_k(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{k-1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} q_i^k + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\sum_{i=1}^{j} c_{ij} q_i^k$ for $k \geq 2$ and $f_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} q_i = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{q^i} = \frac{1}{q-1}$.

Now we define inductively the numbers ε_k. We choose ε_1 in such a way that b_1 is the smallest number of the form $\frac{1}{n_1}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ which is not less than f_1. Then we have $0 \leq \varepsilon_1 = b_1 - f_1 < \frac{1}{n_1} < \frac{q-2}{(q-1)q^2}$ (because of the choice of n_1), so ε_1 lies inside the corresponding interval in (10). For fixed $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{k-1}$ we choose ε_k to make b_k the smallest number of the form $\frac{1}{n_1 \cdots n_k}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ which is not less than $f_k(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{k-1})$. Then $0 \leq \varepsilon_k = b_k - f_k(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{k-1}) < \frac{1}{n_1 \cdots n_k} < \frac{q-2}{(q-1)q^{k^2+1}}$ (again, because of the choice of $n_1, \dots, n_k$), so ε_k satisfies (10). Therefore the sequence $\{b_k\}$ satisfies all the required conditions, and the statement follows. □

Remark. Since so(∞) and sp(∞) are subalgebras of sl(∞), each of them admits also an injective homomorphism into any one-sided pure diagonal Lie algebra of type A.

The following two lemmas show that certain conditions guarantee the existence of injective homomorphisms of non-finitary diagonal Lie algebras.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathfrak{s}_1 = X(\mathcal{T}_1)$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2 = X(\mathcal{T}_2)$ be diagonal Lie algebras of the same type ($X = A$, C, or O), neither of them finitary. Set $S_i = \mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}_i)$, $S = \mathrm{GCD}(S_1, S_2)$, $R_i = \div(S_i, S)$, $\delta_i = \delta(\mathcal{T}_i)$, $C_i = \mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{C}_i)$, $C = \mathrm{GCD}(C_1, C_2)$, $B_i = \div(C_i, C)$, and $\sigma_i = \sigma(\mathcal{T}_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. We assume that R_1 is finite.*

(i) Assume that $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are non-sparse of type A, both R_1 and R_2 are finite, and S is not divisible by an infinite power of any prime number. If $2\frac{R_1}{\delta_1} < \frac{R_2}{\delta_2}$, then $\mathfrak{s}_1$ admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_2$. If $2\frac{R_1}{\delta_1} = \frac{R_2}{\delta_2}$, $\mathfrak{s}_1$ admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_2$ unless $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is pure and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is dense.

(ii) Assume that $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are non-sparse, both R_1 and R_2 are finite, and S is not divisible by an infinite power of any prime number. In addition, assume that one of the following is true:

- *both $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are one-sided;*
- *B_1 is finite, either $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is one-sided and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is two-sided non-symmetric or $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is two-sided weakly non-symmetric and $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is two-sided non-symmetric;*
- *B_1 is finite, both $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are two-sided strongly non-symmetric, either B_2 is infinite or C is divisible by an infinite power of some prime number;*
- *both B_1 and B_2 are finite, both $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are two-sided strongly non-symmetric, C is not divisible by an infinite power of a prime number, and $\frac{R_1\sigma_1}{B_1} \geq \frac{R_2\sigma_2}{B_2}$.*

Then, if $\frac{R_1}{\delta_1} < \frac{R_2}{\delta_2}$, $\mathfrak{s}_1$ admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_2$. If $\frac{R_1}{\delta_1} = \frac{R_2}{\delta_2}$, $\mathfrak{s}_1$ admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_2$ unless $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is pure and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is dense.

(iii) Assume that $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are non-sparse. If R_2 is infinite or S is divisible by an infinite power of some prime number, then $\mathfrak{s}_1$ admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_2$.

(iv) If $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is sparse, then $\mathfrak{s}_1$ admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_2$.

Proof. The Steinitz numbers S_1, C_1 and the indices δ_1, σ_1 are in general not well-defined for a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{s}_1$: these values characterize a given exhaustion of $\mathfrak{s}_1$. However, if $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is non-sparse and S_1 is not divisible by an infinite power of any prime number, then the number $\frac{R_1}{\delta_1}$ does not depend on the exhaustion of $\mathfrak{s}_1$ (because then by condition $\mathcal{A}_2$ of Theorem 2.4 $\frac{\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}_1)}{\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}'_1)}$ is a set containing exactly one element for S'_1 corresponding to any other exhaustion of $\mathfrak{s}_1$, and therefore $\frac{R_1}{\delta_1}$ is well-defined by condition $\mathcal{A}_3$). Also, under the assumptions made in the last statement of (ii) the number $\frac{\sigma_1 R_1}{B_1}$ does not depend on the exhaustion of $\mathfrak{s}_1$ (this follows from condition $\mathcal{B}_3$ of Theorem 2.4). The finiteness of R_1, R_2, B_1, B_2 does not depend on the exhaustion either, so in the proofs of all the statements we can exhaust $\mathfrak{s}_1$ in any convenient way. The same applies to $\mathfrak{s}_2$.

We will assume that $X = A$ and prove all four statements for type A Lie algebras. If $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are of type O or C, then both $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are one-sided and the proof is analogous to the proof in the type A case when $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are one-sided.

Let us now set up the notations for the proof of all four statements. Let $\mathfrak{s}_1$ be exhausted as $\mathrm{sl}(n_0) \subset \mathrm{sl}(n_1) \subset \cdots$, each inclusion $\mathrm{sl}(n_i) \to \mathrm{sl}(n_{i+1})$ being of signature (l_i, r_i, z_i), $i \geq 0$. By possibly changing some first terms of the exhaustion, we can choose n_0 to be divisible by R_1. Similarly, let $\mathrm{sl}(m_0) \subset \mathrm{sl}(m_1) \subset \cdots$ be the exhaustion of $\mathfrak{s}_2$, each inclusion $\mathrm{sl}(m_i) \to \mathrm{sl}(m_{i+1})$ being of signature (l'_i, r'_i, z'_i), $i \geq 0$. Set $s_i = l_i + r_i$, $c_i = l_i - r_i$, $s'_i = l'_i + r'_i$, and $c'_i = l'_i - r'_i$ for $i \geq 0$. Then $S_1 = n_0 s_0 s_1 \cdots$, $C_1 = n_0 c_0 c_1 \cdots$,

$S_2 = m_0 s_0' s_1' \cdots$, $C_2 = m_0 c_0' c_1' \cdots$, $\delta_1 = \lim\limits_{i\to\infty} \dfrac{n_0 s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}}{n_i}$, $\delta_2 = \lim\limits_{i\to\infty} \dfrac{m_0 s_0' \cdots s_{i-1}'}{m_i}$, $\sigma_1 = \lim\limits_{i\to\infty} \dfrac{c_0 \cdots c_i}{s_0 \cdots s_i}$, and $\sigma_2 = \lim\limits_{i\to\infty} \dfrac{c_0' \cdots c_i'}{s_0' \cdots s_i'}$.

Consider a diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{sl}(n_0) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_0"'] & \mathrm{sl}(n_1) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_1"'] & \cdots \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(n_i) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_i"'] & \mathrm{sl}(n_{i+1}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_{i+1}"'] & \cdots \\
\mathrm{sl}(m_{k_0}) \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(m_{k_1}) \arrow[r] & \cdots \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(m_{k_i}) \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(m_{k_{i+1}}) \arrow[r] & \cdots,
\end{tikzcd} \tag{11}$$

where θ_i is a diagonal homomorphism of signature $(x_i, y_i, m_{k_i} - (x_i + y_i)n_i)$, $i \geq 0$. Taking into consideration our remark at the end of section 2, we see that to make such a diagram well-defined and commutative it is enough to have

$$s_i(x_{i+1} + y_{i+1}) = (x_i + y_i) s_{k_i}' \cdots s_{k_{i+1}-1}', \tag{12}$$

$$c_i(x_{i+1} - y_{i+1}) = (x_i - y_i) c_{k_i}' \cdots c_{k_{i+1}-1}', \tag{13}$$

and

$$m_{k_i} \geq (x_i + y_i) n_i \tag{14}$$

for $i \geq 0$. Finally, we set $p_0 = \frac{n_0}{R_1}$ and $p_i = p_0 s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}$ for $i \geq 1$. We are now ready to prove that there exist numbers x_i, y_i, $i \geq 0$ satisfying (12) $-$ (14) in all four cases.

(i) The Steinitz number R_2 is finite in this case. Possibly by changing the exhaustion of $\mathfrak{s}_2$ we can choose m_0 to be divisible by R_2. Choose also each k_i large enough so that $m_0 s_0' \cdots s_{k_i-1}'$ is divisible by $R_2 p_i$ (this is possible since p_i divides S) and put $q_i = \frac{m_0 s_0' \cdots s_{k_i-1}'}{R_2 p_i}$ for $i \geq 0$. Put $x_i = y_i = q_i$. Then it is easy to verify that (12) and (13) hold, and (14) is equivalent to $\frac{m_0 s_0' \cdots s_{k_i-1}'}{R_2 m_{k_i}} \leq \frac{n_0 s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}}{2R_1 n_i}$.

Suppose that $\frac{\delta_2}{R_2} < \frac{\delta_1}{2R_1}$. Pick $\alpha \in (\frac{\delta_2}{R_2}, \frac{\delta_1}{2R_1})$. Since $\delta_1 = \lim\limits_{i\to\infty} \dfrac{n_0 s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}}{n_i}$ and $\delta_2 = \lim\limits_{i\to\infty} \dfrac{m_0 s_0' \cdots s_i'}{m_i}$ we have $\frac{m_0 s_0' \cdots s_{k_i-1}'}{R_2 m_{k_i}} \leq \alpha \leq \frac{n_0 s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}}{2R_1 n_i}$ for $i \geq i_0$, $k_i \geq j_0$. Obviously we can choose each k_i greater than j_0. Also we can construct θ_i only for $i \geq i_0$ and the diagram in (11) will still give us an injective homomorphism of $\mathfrak{s}_1$ into $\mathfrak{s}_2$.

Let now $\frac{\delta_2}{R_2} = \frac{\delta_1}{2R_1}$. If $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is pure then $\frac{m_0 s_0' \cdots s_{k_i-1}'}{R_2 m_{k_i}} = \frac{\delta_2}{R_2} = \frac{\delta_1}{2R_1} \leq \frac{n_0 s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}}{2R_1 n_i}$, where the latter inequality holds because the sequence $\frac{n_0 s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}}{n_i}$ is decreasing. Finally, if both $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are dense, then for each i we have $\frac{\delta_2}{R_2} = \frac{\delta_1}{2R_1} < \frac{n_0 s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}}{2R_1 n_i}$, so to make $\frac{m_0 s_0' \cdots s_{k_i-1}'}{R_2 m_{k_i}} \leq \frac{n_0 s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}}{2R_1 n_i}$ we choose k_i sufficiently large.

(ii) Possibly by changing the exhaustions of $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ we choose n_0 to be divisible by $R_1 2^u$ and m_0 to be divisible by $R_2 2^u$, where u is the maximal power of 2 dividing S (u is finite because 2^∞ does not divide S). We also choose m_0 large enough so that $\frac{m_0}{R_2} \geq \frac{n_0}{R_1}$. Denote again $q_i = \frac{m_0 s_0' \cdots s_{k_i-1}'}{R_2 p_i}$, $i \geq 0$ (k_i is chosen large enough to make $R_2 p_i$ divide $m_0 s_0' \cdots s_{k_i-1}'$).

If both $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are one-sided, we put $x_i = q_i, y_i = 0$. In the other three cases B_1 is finite, so $c_0 c_1 \cdots$ divides $M c_0' c_1' \cdots$ for some finite M. By changing the exhaustion of $\mathfrak{s}_1$ we can make $c_0 c_1 \cdots$ divide $c_0' c_1' \cdots$. For that we replace the signature (l_i, r_i, z_i) with $((l_i + r_i + 1)/2, (l_i + r_i - 1)/2, z_i)$ for finitely many i ($l_i + r_i$ is odd for all $i \geq 0$ because $s_0 s_1 \cdots = \frac{R_1 S}{n_0}$ is not divisible by 2). Now we can choose each k_i large enough so that $c_0 \cdots c_{i-1}$ divides $c_0' \cdots c_{k_i-1}'$. Then denote $t_i = \frac{c_0' \cdots c_{k_i-1}'}{c_0 \cdots c_{i-1}}$ for $i \geq 1$ and $t_0 = 1$. Notice that for each $i \geq 0$ the numbers c_i and c_i' have the same parities as the numbers s_i and s_i' respectively. But all s_i and s_i' are odd, so c_i and c_i' are odd as well. Hence t_i and q_i are odd, and we put $x_i = (q_i + t_i)/2$ and $y_i = (q_i - t_i)/2$. Let us check that $y_i \geq 0$ (or $q_i \geq t_i$). This is obvious for $i = 0$. For $i \geq 1$ the inequality $y_i \geq 0$ is equivalent to $\frac{R_2}{m_0} \cdot \frac{c_0' \cdots c_{k_i-1}'}{s_0' \cdots s_{k_i-1}'} \leq \frac{R_1}{n_0} \cdot \frac{c_0 \cdots c_{i-1}}{s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}}$, or

$$\frac{R_2}{m_0} (\sigma_2)_{k_i} \leq \frac{R_1}{n_0} (\sigma_1)_i, \tag{15}$$

where $(\sigma_1)_i = \frac{c_0 \cdots c_{i-1}}{s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}}$ is a decreasing sequence which tends to σ_1 and $(\sigma_2)_i = \frac{c_0' \cdots c_{i-1}'}{s_0' \cdots s_{i-1}'}$ is a decreasing sequence which tends to σ_2. Let us verify the inequality in (15) case by case.

If $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is one-sided, then $(\sigma_1)_i = 1$ for $i \geq 1$ and our inequality is equivalent to $(\sigma_2)_{k_i} \leq \frac{m_0 R_1}{n_0 R_2}$. This holds in case $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is two-sided non-symmetric because of the assumption $\frac{m_0}{R_2} \geq \frac{n_0}{R_1}$ made at the beginning of the proof. If $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is two-sided weakly non-symmetric, then $\lim\limits_{i\to\infty}(\sigma_2)_{k_i} = \sigma_2 = 0$, and therefore $(\sigma_2)_{k_i} \leq \frac{m_0R_1}{n_0R_2}(\sigma_1)_i$ for large enough k_i in case $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is two-sided non-symmetric.

Let now both $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ be two-sided strongly non-symmetric, B_2 be infinite or C be divisible by an infinite power of some prime number. In this case there exists an infinite Steinitz number C' such that $c_0c_1\cdots$ divides $\frac{1}{C'}c'_0c'_1\cdots$. Since $\sigma_1 = \lim\limits_{i\to\infty}(\sigma_1)_i > 0$ and the sequence $(\sigma_1)_i$ decreases, to verify (15) it suffices to prove that $(\sigma_2)_{k_i} \leq \frac{m_0R_1}{n_0R_2}\sigma_1$. We have $\frac{m_0}{R_2} \geq \frac{n_0}{R_1}$, therefore it is enough to prove that $(\sigma_2)_{k_i} \leq \sigma_1$. This clearly holds for large enough k_i if $\sigma_2 < \sigma_1$. Otherwise we change the exhaustion of $\mathfrak{s}_2$ such that the new symmetry index $\tilde{\sigma}_2 = \sigma_2/N$ is less than σ_1 for a finite $N|C'$ (we replace l'_i, r'_i by $(s'_i+u)/2, (s'_i-u)/2$ respectively, where $c'_i = uv$ and $v|N$ for finitely many i) and repeat the same construction of x_i, y_i. Then σ_1 stays the same and in the new construction the inequality $(\tilde{\sigma}_2)_{k_i} \leq \sigma_1$ holds for large enough k_i.

Finally, let both B_1 and B_2 be finite, both $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ be two-sided strongly non-symmetric, C be not divisible by an infinite power of a prime number, and $\frac{R_1\sigma_1}{B_1} \geq \frac{R_2\sigma_2}{B_2}$. Then $c'_0c'_1\cdots = Nc_0c_1\cdots$ for an odd number N, and by possibly changing the exhaustion of $\mathfrak{s}_2$ we can make $c'_0c'_1\cdots = c_0c_1\cdots$ and repeat the same construction. Then $\frac{B_1}{B_2} = \frac{n_0}{m_0}$, and therefore $\frac{R_1\sigma_1}{R_2\sigma_2} \geq \frac{B_1}{B_2} = \frac{n_0}{m_0}$. Then $\lim\limits_{i\to\infty}(\sigma_2)_{k_i} = \sigma_2 < \dfrac{m_0R_1}{n_0R_2}(\sigma_1)_i$ for all i, since $(\sigma_1)_i$ is a decreasing sequence which does not stabilize. Now clearly (15) holds for large enough k_i.

So far we have proven that in all cases we can choose exhaustions of $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ such that $x_i = \frac{1}{2}(q_i+t_i)$ and $y_i = \frac{1}{2}(q_i - t_i)$ are non-negative integers (in the first case, where both $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are one-sided, we just put $t_i = q_i$, so $x_i = q_i$, $y_i = 0$). Since we have $x_i + y_i = q_i$ and $x_i - y_i = t_i$, it is easy to check (12) and (13). The condition in (14) is equivalent to $\frac{m_0s'_0\cdots s'_{k_i-1}}{R_2m_{k_i}} \leq \frac{n_0s_0\cdots s_{i-1}}{R_1n_i}$, and under the assumption $\frac{\delta_2}{R_2} < \frac{\delta_1}{R_1}$ or $\frac{\delta_2}{R_2} = \frac{\delta_1}{R_1}$ its proof is analogous to that in (i).

(iii) Let us fix an exhaustion of $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and choose m_0 in the exhaustion of $\mathfrak{s}_2$ such that $R'_2p_0|m_0$ and $\frac{m_0}{R'_2}s'_0s'_1\cdots$ is divisible by S for some finite R'_2. Moreover, we can choose R'_2 to be arbitrary large (if R_2 is infinite, then R'_2 can be any divisor of R_2; if $p^\infty|S$, then R'_2 can be p^N for any $N \geq 1$). Denote $q_i = \frac{m_0s'_0\cdots s'_{k_i-1}}{R'_2p_i}$ and put $x_i = y_i = q_i$ ($x_i = 2q_i$, $y_i = 0$ for types O and C). Similar to the proof of (i), the conditions in (12) and (13) are satisfied, and (14) is equivalent to the inequality $\frac{m_0s'_0\cdots s'_{k_i-1}}{R'_2m_{k_i}} \leq \frac{n_0s_0\cdots s_{i-1}}{2R_1n_i}$. Since the exhaustion of $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is fixed, the right-hand side is bounded by $\frac{\delta_1}{2R_1}$ from below. But $\frac{m_0s'_0\cdots s'_{k_i-1}}{R'_2m_{k_i}} \leq \frac{1}{R'_2}$, and therefore it is enough to choose R'_2 to be greater than $\frac{2R_1}{\delta_1}$.

(iv) Choose each k_i large enough so that $m_0s'_0\cdots s'_{k_i-1}$ is divisible by p_i and denote $q_i = \frac{m_0s'_0\cdots s'_{k_i-1}}{p_i}$, $i \geq 0$. Then put $x_i = y_i = q_i$ ($x_i = 2q_i$, $y_i = 0$ for types O and C). The conditions in (12) and (13) are again satisfied, and (14) is equivalent to the inequality $\frac{m_0s'_0\cdots s'_{k_i-1}}{m_{k_i}} \leq \frac{n_0s_0\cdots s_{i-1}}{2R_1n_i}$. But $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is sparse, therefore $\lim\limits_{i\to\infty}\dfrac{m_0s'_0\cdots s'_i}{m_i} = 0$, so the inequality holds for large enough k_i. □

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\mathfrak{s}_1 = X_1(\mathcal{T}_1)$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2 = X_2(\mathcal{T}_2)$ be diagonal Lie algebras, neither of them finitary. Set $S_i = \mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}_i)$, $S = \mathrm{GCD}(S_1, S_2)$, $R_i = \div(S_i, S)$, and $\delta_i = \delta(\mathcal{T}_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. We assume that R_1 is finite.*

(i) Assume that $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are non-sparse, both R_1 and R_2 are finite, and S is not divisible by an infinite power of any prime number. In addition, let $(X_1, X_2) = (A, C)$, (A, O), (O, C), or (C, O). If $2\frac{R_1}{\delta_1} < \frac{R_2}{\delta_2}$, then $\mathfrak{s}_1$ admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_2$. If $2\frac{R_1}{\delta_1} = \frac{R_2}{\delta_2}$, $\mathfrak{s}_1$ admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_2$ unless $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is pure and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is dense.

(ii) Assume that $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are non-sparse, both R_1 and R_2 are finite, and S is not divisible by an infinite power of any prime number. In addition, assume that $(X_1, X_2) = (C, A)$ or (O, A). If $\frac{R_1}{\delta_1} < \frac{R_2}{\delta_2}$, then $\mathfrak{s}_1$ admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_2$. If $\frac{R_1}{\delta_1} = \frac{R_2}{\delta_2}$, $\mathfrak{s}_1$ admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_2$ unless $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is pure and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is dense.

(iii) Assume that $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are non-sparse. If R_2 is infinite or S is divisible by an infinite power of some prime number, then $\mathfrak{s}_1$ admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_2$.

(iv) If $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is sparse, then $\mathfrak{s}_1$ admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_2$.

Proof. The proofs of all four statements in the lemma are analogous to the corresponding proofs of Lemma 3.2. We will point out only the essential differences.

(i) If $(X_1, X_2) = (A, C)$ or (A, O), we put $x_i = y_i = q_i$ as in the proof of Lemma 3.2 (i). If $(X_1, X_2) = (O, C)$ or (C, O), we put $x_i = 2q_i$, $y_i = 0$. Since we are dealing with Lie algebras of different types we have to pay attention the additional conditions of Lemma 2.9, which are obviously satisfied. The rest of the proof is the same and the diagram in (11) (with Lie algebras of corresponding types) yields an injective homomorphism of $\mathfrak{s}_1$ into $\mathfrak{s}_2$.

(ii) Since $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is of type O or C, $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is one-sided. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is not two-sided symmetric because 2^∞ does not divide S_2. Thus $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is either one-sided or two-sided non-symmetric. Both cases were considered in Lemma 3.2 (ii) for type A Lie algebras. The construction of an injective homomorphism of $\mathfrak{s}_1$ into $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is the same in the case we now consider.

(iii), (iv) If $(X_1, X_2) = (A, C)$ or (A, O), we put $x_i = y_i = q_i$, and if $(X_1, X_2) = (C, A)$, (O, A), (O, C), or (C, O), we put $x_i = 2q_i$, $y_i = 0$. The proofs of (iii) and (iv) are completed in a similar way to the proofs of Lemma 3.2 (iii) and (iv). ☐

Corollary 3.4. *The three finitary Lie algebras* $\mathrm{sl}(\infty)$*,* $\mathrm{so}(\infty)$*, and* $\mathrm{sp}(\infty)$ *admit an injective homomorphism into any diagonal Lie algebra.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a diagonal Lie algebra. If $\mathfrak{s}$ is finitary, then $\mathfrak{s}$ is isomorphic to one of the three Lie algebras $\mathrm{sl}(\infty)$, $\mathrm{so}(\infty)$, $\mathrm{sp}(\infty)$. Hence $\mathrm{sl}(\infty)$, $\mathrm{so}(\infty)$, admit $\mathrm{sp}(\infty)$ admit an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}$. If $\mathfrak{s}$ is not finitary, then (by an easy corollary from Lemma 3.3 (iii), (iv)) there exists a pure one-sided Lie algebra of type A $\mathfrak{s}'$ which admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}$. Then each of the Lie algebras $\mathrm{sl}(\infty)$, $\mathrm{so}(\infty)$, $\mathrm{sp}(\infty)$ can be mapped by an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}'$ by Proposition 3.1, and the statement follows. ☐

Proposition 3.5. *Let* $\mathfrak{s}_1 = X_1(\mathcal{T}_1)$ *be a subalgebra of* $\mathfrak{s}_2 = X_2(\mathcal{T}_2)$*. Set* $S_1 = \mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}_1)$*,* $S_2 = \mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}_2)$*. Then* $S_1 | S_2 N$ *for some* $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$*.*

Proof. We take $\mathfrak{s} := \mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{s}_2$, in order to use the notation $\mathfrak{s}_i$ for an exhaustion of $\mathfrak{s}$. Since $\mathfrak{s}$ admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{g}$ there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathfrak{s}_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_1"'] & \cdots \arrow[r] & \mathfrak{s}_i \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_i"'] & \cdots \\
\mathfrak{g}_{k_1} \arrow[r] & \cdots \arrow[r] & \mathfrak{g}_{k_i} \arrow[r] & \cdots.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Set $M = I_{\mathfrak{s}_1}^{\mathfrak{g}_{k_1}}(\theta_1)$. Then, by Proposition 2.2 (ii), we have $I_{\mathfrak{g}_{k_1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{k_i}} M = I_{\mathfrak{s}_1}^{\mathfrak{s}_i} I_{\mathfrak{s}_i}^{\mathfrak{g}_{k_i}}(\theta_i)$ for $i \geq 1$. Then $\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} I_{\mathfrak{s}_j}^{\mathfrak{s}_{j+1}} | M \prod_{j=k_1}^{k_i-1} I_{\mathfrak{g}_j}^{\mathfrak{g}_{j+1}}$ for $i \geq 1$. Thus, $S_1 | S_2 M n_1$, where n_1 is the dimension of the natural representation of $\mathfrak{s}_1$. ☐

Proposition 3.6. *Let* $\mathfrak{s}$ *be a sparse one-sided Lie algebra of type* A *not isomorphic to* $\mathrm{sl}(\infty)$*. Then* $\mathfrak{s}$ *admits no non-trivial homomorphism into a pure one-sided Lie algebra of type* A*.*

Proof. Assume for the sake of a contradiction that there is an injective homomorphism of $\mathfrak{s}$ into some pure one-sided Lie algebra of type A. Let $\mathfrak{s}$ be exhausted as $\mathrm{sl}(n_1) \subset \mathrm{sl}(n_2) \subset \cdots$, each inclusion $\mathrm{sl}(n_i) \to \mathrm{sl}(n_{i+1})$ being of signature $(l_i, 0, z_i)$. Recall that by the definition of a sparse Lie algebra, $\lim\limits_{i\to\infty} \dfrac{n_1 l_1 \cdots l_{i-1}}{n_i} = 0$. Then there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{sl}(n_1) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_1"'] & \cdots \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(n_i) \arrow[r, "{(l_i,0,z_i)}"] \arrow[d, "\theta_i"'] & \mathrm{sl}(n_{i+1}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_{i+1}"'] & \cdots \\
\mathrm{sl}(m_1) \arrow[r] & \cdots \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(m_1 \cdots m_i) \arrow[r, "{(m_{i+1},0,0)}"] & \mathrm{sl}(m_1 \cdots m_{i+1}) \arrow[r] & \cdots.
\end{tikzcd} \tag{16}$$

The lower row constitutes an exhaustion of the pure Lie algebra $\mathrm{sl}(m_1 m_2 \cdots)$.

Denote by V_i the natural $\mathrm{sl}(m_1 \cdots m_i)$-module for $i \geq 1$. Note that θ_i makes V_i into an $\mathrm{sl}(n_i)$-module. Let

$$V_i \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n_i) \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in H_i} T_\lambda \otimes F_{n_i}^\lambda \tag{17}$$

be the decomposition into a direct sum of isotypic components. Here $T_\lambda = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{sl}(n_i)}(F_{n_i}^\lambda, V_i \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n_i))$ is a trivial $\mathrm{sl}(n_i)$-module, and H_i is the set of all highest weights appearing in this decomposition. We can rewrite (17) (non-canonically) as

$$V_i \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n_i) \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in H_i} \underbrace{F_{n_i}^\lambda \oplus \cdots \oplus F_{n_i}^\lambda}_{t_\lambda}, \tag{18}$$

where $t_\lambda = \dim T_\lambda$. Since all weights $\lambda \in H_i$ are dominant, for each $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n_i})$, $\lambda_1 - \lambda_{n_i}$ is a non-negative integer. Set $d_i = \max\limits_{\lambda \in H_i}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_{n_i})$. We define $H(\varphi)$ and $d(\varphi)$ in a similar way for an arbitrary injective homomorphism φ of finite-dimensional classical simple Lie algebras of type A, so that $H(\theta_i) = H_i$ and $d(\theta_i) = d_i$.

Let us show that $d_i \geq d_{i+1}$ for $i \geq 1$. By φ_i we denote the injective homomorphism $\mathrm{sl}(m_1 \cdots m_i) \xrightarrow{(m_{i+1},0,0)} \mathrm{sl}(m_1 \cdots m_{i+1})$ as in (16). Notice first that $H(\varphi_i \circ \theta_i) = H(\theta_i) = H_i$ and $\dim \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{sl}(n_i)}(F^\lambda_{n_i}, V_{i+1}) = m_{i+1} \dim \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{sl}(n_i)}(F^\lambda_{n_i}, V_i)$ for all $\lambda \in H_i$. Furthermore, $d(\varphi_i \circ \theta_i) = d(\theta_i) = d_i$.

Let $\lambda \in H_{i+1}$ be a weight such that $\lambda_1 - \lambda_{n_{i+1}} = d_{i+1}$. Since $(l_i, 0, z_i)$ is the signature of the diagonal injective homomorphism $\mathrm{sl}(n_i) \to \mathrm{sl}(n_{i+1})$, there is a chain of inclusions $\mathrm{sl}(n_i) \subset \mathrm{sl}(l_i n_i) \subset \mathrm{sl}(l_i n_i + 1) \subset \cdots \subset \mathrm{sl}(l_i n_i + z_i) = \mathrm{sl}(n_{i+1})$ such that their composition is the original map in (16). Applying Gelfand-Tsetlin rule (see Theorem 2.6) repeatedly we obtain that $F^\lambda_{n_{i+1}} \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(l_i n_i + z_i - j)$ has a submodule with highest weight $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{l_i n_i + z_i - j - 2}, \lambda_{l_i n_i + z_i - j - 1}, \lambda_{n_{i+1}})$ for $j = 1, \dots, z_i$. We then apply Corollary 2.8 to the submodule of $F^\lambda_{n_{i+1}} \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(l_i n_i)$ with highest weight $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{l_i n_i - 1}, \lambda_{n_{i+1}})$ and see $\hat\lambda := (\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_{l_i}, \lambda_{l_i+1} + \cdots + \lambda_{2l_i}, \dots, \lambda_{l_i n_i - l_i + 1} + \cdots + \lambda_{l_i n_i - 1} + \lambda_{n_{i+1}}) \in H(\varphi_i \circ \theta_i)$, i.e. the $\mathrm{sl}(n_i)$-module with highest weight $\hat\lambda$ is a constituent of $F^\lambda_{n_{i+1}} \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n_i)$. Hence, $d(\varphi_i \circ \theta_i) \geq (\hat\lambda_1 - \hat\lambda_{n_i}) = (\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_{l_i}) - (\lambda_{l_i n_i - l_i + 1} + \cdots + \lambda_{l_i n_i - 1} + \lambda_{n_{i+1}}) \geq \lambda_1 - \lambda_{n_{i+1}} = d_{i+1}$, where the latter inequality holds because λ is dominant. Since $d(\varphi_i \circ \theta_i) = d_i$, we have the desired inequality $d_i \geq d_{i+1}$.

Since $\{d_i\}$ is a decreasing sequence of positive integers, it stabilizes, so there exists $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $d_i = d$ for all $i \geq J$. Pick K such that $l_J \cdots l_{K-1} > d$ (this is possible since $\mathfrak{s}$ is not isomorphic to $\mathrm{sl}(\infty)$, and therefore $\prod\limits_{i=1}^{\infty} l_i$ is infinite). Consider now the following part of the diagram in (16):

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{sl}(n_J) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_J"'] & \cdots \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(n_K) \arrow[d, "\theta_K"'] \\
\mathrm{sl}(m_1 \cdots m_J) \arrow[r] & \cdots \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(m_1 \cdots m_K).
\end{tikzcd}$$

The injective homomorphism $\mathrm{sl}(n_J) \to \mathrm{sl}(n_K)$ is diagonal of signature $(l, 0, z)$, where $l = l_J \cdots l_{K-1}$ and $z = n_K - l n_J$. Using similar arguments as above we obtain that $\hat\lambda = (\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_l, \lambda_{l+1} + \cdots + \lambda_{2l}, \dots, \lambda_{n_K - l + 1} + \cdots + \lambda_{n_K - 1} + \lambda_{n_K}) \in H_J$ for any $\lambda \in H_K$. Then we have $\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_l - (\lambda_{n_K - l + 1} + \cdots + \lambda_{n_K}) \leq d$. If $\lambda_{d+1} \neq \lambda_{n_K - d}$, then $\lambda_{d+1} \geq \lambda_{n_K - d} + 1$, in which case $\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_l - (\lambda_{n_K - l + 1} + \cdots + \lambda_{n_K}) \geq (\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_{d+1}) - (\lambda_{n_K - d} + \cdots + \lambda_{n_K}) \geq d + 1$ as $l > d$. Hence, $\lambda_{d+1} = \lambda_{n_K - d}$ which yields $\lambda_{d+1} = \lambda_{d+2} = \cdots = \lambda_{n_K - d}$. We thus conclude that for $i \geq K$ each integral dominant weight appearing in H_i has the property that all its values apart from the first d and the last d must be equal.

Let us calculate the index $I^{\mathrm{sl}(m_1 \cdots m_i)}_{\mathrm{sl}(n_1)}$ of the corresponding composition of homomorphisms in (16). Using Proposition 2.2 (ii) and Corollary 2.3, we compute $I^{\mathrm{sl}(m_1 \cdots m_i)}_{\mathrm{sl}(n_1)} = I(\theta_1) m_2 \cdots m_i$ by following down θ_1 and to the right; similarly we compute $I^{\mathrm{sl}(m_1 \cdots m_i)}_{\mathrm{sl}(n_1)} = l_1 \cdots l_{i-1} I(\theta_i)$ by going to the right and then down θ_i. By Proposition 2.2 (iii), (iv) we have

$$I(\theta_i) = \sum_{\lambda \in H_i} t_\lambda I(F^\lambda_{n_i}) = \frac{1}{n_i^2 - 1} \sum_{\lambda \in H_i} t_\lambda \dim F^\lambda_{n_i} \langle \lambda, \lambda + 2\rho \rangle_{\mathrm{sl}(n_i)}, \tag{19}$$

where 2ρ is the sum of all the positive roots of $\mathrm{sl}(n_i)$.

Note that $\langle \lambda, \lambda + 2\rho \rangle_{\mathrm{sl}(n_i)} = (\tilde\lambda, \tilde\lambda + 2\rho)$, where $\tilde\lambda_j = \lambda_j - \dfrac{1}{n_i} \sum\limits_{k=1}^{n_i} \lambda_k$ for $j = 1, \dots, n_i$, $2\rho = (n_i - 1, n_i - 3, \dots, -(n_i - 1))$, and $(\ ,\ )$ is the usual scalar product on $\mathbb{C}^{n_i}$.

Fix $i \geq K$, using the notation from above, so that $\lambda_1 - \lambda_{n_i} \leq d$ and $\lambda_{d+1} = \lambda_{d+1} = \cdots = \lambda_{n_i - d}$. Set $\alpha = \tilde\lambda_{d+1}$, so that $|\tilde\lambda_j - \alpha| = 0$ for $j = d+1, d+2, \dots, n_i - d$. Then $|\tilde\lambda_j - \alpha| = |\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1}| \leq d$ for all j.

Since $\sum\limits_{j=1}^{n_i}\tilde\lambda_j = 0$ and $\tilde\lambda_1 - \tilde\lambda_{n_i} = \lambda_1 - \lambda_{n_i} \le d$, we have $|\tilde\lambda_j| \le d$ for all j. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle\lambda,\lambda+2\rho\rangle_{\mathrm{sl}(n_i)}| = |(\tilde\lambda,\tilde\lambda+2\rho)| &= \left|\sum_{j=1}^{n_i}\tilde\lambda_j(\tilde\lambda_j+n_i-2j+1)\right| \\
&= \left|\sum_{j=1}^{n_i}\tilde\lambda_j(\tilde\lambda_j-\alpha-2j)+(n_i+1+\alpha)\sum_{j=1}^{n_i}\tilde\lambda_j\right| \\
&= \left|\sum_{j=1}^{n_i}(\tilde\lambda_j-\alpha+\alpha)(\tilde\lambda_j-\alpha-2j)\right| \\
&= \left|\sum_{j=1}^{n_i}(\tilde\lambda_j-\alpha)^2-2\sum_{j=1}^{n_i}(\tilde\lambda_j-\alpha)j+\sum_{i=1}^{n_i}(\alpha(\tilde\lambda_j-\alpha)-2\alpha j)\right| \\
&= \left|\sum_{j=1}^{n_i}(\tilde\lambda_j-\alpha)^2-2\sum_{j=1}^{d}(\tilde\lambda_j-\alpha)j-2\sum_{j=n_i-d+1}^{n_i}(\tilde\lambda_j-\alpha)j-n_i\alpha^2-n_i(n_i+1)\alpha\right| \\
&\le \sum_{j=1}^{n_i}d^2+2\sum_{j=1}^{d}jd+2\sum_{j=n_i-d+1}^{n_i}jd+n_i\alpha^2+n_i(n_i+1)|\alpha| \\
&= 2n_id^2+2(n_i+1)d^2+n_i\alpha^2+n_i(n_i+1)|\alpha|.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde\lambda_1+\cdots+\tilde\lambda_d+\alpha(n_i-2d)+\tilde\lambda_{n_i-d+1}+\cdots+\tilde\lambda_{n_i}=0$ (which implies $|\alpha| \le \frac{2d^2}{n_i-2d}$), we obtain the following inequality:

$$|\langle\lambda,\lambda+2\rho\rangle_{\mathrm{sl}(n_i)}| \le 2d^2n_i+2d^2(n_i+1)+\frac{4d^4n_i}{(n_i-2d)^2}+\frac{2d^2n_i(n_i+1)}{n_i-2d} \le c_0n_i$$

for all $i \ge K$, where c_0 is some positive constant. Then from (19) we have $I(\theta_i) \le \dfrac{c_0n_i}{n_i^2-1}\sum\limits_{\lambda\in H_i} t_\lambda \dim F_{n_i}^\lambda = \dfrac{c_0n_i}{n_i^2-1}m_1\cdots m_i$. Hence, $I(\theta_1)m_2\cdots m_i = I_{\mathrm{sl}(n_1)}^{\mathrm{sl}(m_1\cdots m_i)} = l_1\cdots l_{i-1}I(\theta_i) \le l_1\cdots l_{i-1}\frac{c_0n_i}{n_i^2-1}m_1\cdots m_i$. This implies $\frac{I(\theta_1)}{c_0m_1} \le l_1\cdots l_{i-1}\frac{n_i}{n_i^2-1}$, so $\frac{l_1\cdots l_{i-1}}{n_i} \ge c_1$ for some positive constant c_1. The last inequality contradicts the fact that $\lim\limits_{i\to\infty}\dfrac{n_1l_1\cdots l_{i-1}}{n_i}=0$, so the proposition follows. □

Corollary 3.7. *Let* $\mathfrak{s}_1$, $\mathfrak{s}_2$ *be non-finitary diagonal Lie algebras. Assume that* $\mathfrak{s}_1$ *is sparse and there is an injective homomorphism of* $\mathfrak{s}_1$ *into* $\mathfrak{s}_2$*. Then* $\mathfrak{s}_2$ *must be sparse as well.*

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is pure or dense. Lemma 3.3 (iv) implies that there exists a sparse one-sided Lie algebra of type A $\mathfrak{s}_1'$ which admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_1$. By Lemma 3.3 (iii) there exists a pure one-sided Lie algebra of type A $\mathfrak{s}_2'$ such that $\mathfrak{s}_2$ admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_2'$. If $\mathfrak{s}_1$ would admit an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_2$, then $\mathfrak{s}_1'$ would admit an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_2'$ through the chain $\mathfrak{s}_1' \subset \mathfrak{s}_1 \subset \mathfrak{s}_2 \subset \mathfrak{s}_2'$, which would contradict Proposition 3.6. Hence the statement holds. □

Proposition 3.8. *Let* $\mathfrak{s}_1 = A(\mathcal{T}_1)$ *and* $\mathfrak{s}_2 = A(\mathcal{T}_2)$ *be pure one-sided Lie algebras, neither of them finitary. Set* $S_i = \mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}_i)$ *for* $i = 1, 2$*, and* $S = \mathrm{GCD}(S_1, S_2)$*. Assume that both Steinitz numbers* $\div(S_1, S)$ *and* $\div(S_2, S)$ *are finite and* S *is not divisible by an infinite power of any prime number. An injective homomorphism of* $\mathfrak{s}_1$ *into* $\mathfrak{s}_2$ *is necessarily diagonal.*

Proof. Let $S = p_1^{l_1}p_2^{l_2}\cdots$ for the increasing sequence $\{p_i\}$ of all prime numbers dividing S. Denote $n_i = \frac{S_1}{S}(p_1)^{l_1}\cdots(p_{N+i})^{l_{N+i}}$ for $i \ge 0$, with integer N to be fixed later. Suppose that there is an injective homomorphism $\theta : \mathfrak{s}_1 \to \mathfrak{s}_2$. Then it is given by the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{sl}(n_0) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_0"'] & \cdots \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(n_i) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_i"'] & \mathrm{sl}(n_{i+1}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_{i+1}"'] & \cdots \\
\mathrm{sl}(m_0) \arrow[r] & \cdots \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(m_i) \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(m_{i+1}) \arrow[r] & \cdots,
\end{tikzcd} \tag{20}$$

where $m_i = \frac{S_2}{S}(p_1)^{l_1}\cdots(p_{N+k_i})^{l_{N+k_i}}$ for $i \ge 0$ for some $k_0, k_1, \ldots$. By possibly shifting the bottom row of the diagram we may assume that $k_i \ge i+1$ for each $i \ge 0$.

Denote by W_i the natural $\mathrm{sl}(m_i)$-module. Let $H(\varphi)$ and $d(\varphi)$ be as in the proof of Proposition 3.5 for an arbitrary injective homomorphism φ of finite-dimensional classical simple Lie algebras of type A. Set $H_i = H(\theta_i)$ and $d_i = d(\theta_i)$ for $i \geq 0$. Similarly to (18) we then have

$$W_i \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n_i) \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in H_i} \underbrace{F^{\lambda}_{n_i} \oplus \cdots \oplus F^{\lambda}_{n_i}}_{t_{\lambda,i}},$$

where $t_{\lambda,i} = \dim \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{sl}(n_i)}(F^{\lambda}_{n_i}, W_i \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n_i))$.

Similarly to the proof of Proposition 3.5, $\{d_i\}$ is a decreasing sequence, and therefore $d_i = d$ for $i \geq i_0$. By choosing N large enough we make $d_i = d$ and $p_{N+i} > d+1$ for all $i \geq 0$. Take now $0 \leq i < j \leq k_i$ and consider the following piece of the diagram in (20):

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathrm{sl}(n_i) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_i"'] & \cdots \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(n_j) \arrow[d, "\theta_j"'] \\ \mathrm{sl}(m_i) \arrow[r] & \cdots \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(m_j). \end{tikzcd} \tag{21}$$

Here the injective homomorphism $\mathrm{sl}(n_i) \to \mathrm{sl}(n_j)$ is of signature $(q, 0, 0)$, where $q = (p_{N+i+1})^{l_{N+i+1}} \cdots (p_{N+j})^{l_{N+j}}$. Take an arbitrary non-trivial highest weight λ in H_j, yielding the $\mathrm{sl}(n_j)$-module $F^{\lambda}_{n_j}$. Since $n_j = qn_i$, by Proposition 2.7 we have

$$F^{\lambda}_{qn_i} \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n_i) \cong \bigoplus_{\nu} \Big(\sum_{\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_q} c^{\lambda}_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_q} c^{\nu}_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_q} \Big) F^{\nu}_{n_i}.$$

Since the coefficients $c^{\lambda}_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_q}$ and $c^{\nu}_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_q}$ are independent of the order of $\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_q$, we can rewrite this as

$$F^{\lambda}_{qn_i} \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n_i) \cong \bigoplus_{\nu} \Big(\sum_{[\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_q]} C_q^{q_1,\ldots,q_r} c^{\lambda}_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_q} c^{\nu}_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_q} \Big) F^{\nu}_{n_i}. \tag{22}$$

Here $[\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_q]$ denotes the multiset with these elements, and $q_1,\ldots,q_r$ are the corresponding multiplicities, so that $q_1 + \cdots + q_r = q$.

Fix a highest weight ν such that $F^{\nu}_{n_i}$ has non-zero multiplicity in (22) and fix a multiset of integral dominant weights $[\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_q]$ making both generalized Littlewood-Richardson coefficients $c^{\lambda}_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_q}$ and $c^{\nu}_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_q}$ non-zero. We will show that q divides $C_q^{q_1,\ldots,q_r}$ (and hence the contribution from $[\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_q]$ to the multiplicity of $F^{\nu}_{n_i}$) if the module $F^{\nu}_{n_i}$ is non-trivial. Suppose that p_l divides all $q_1,\ldots,q_r$ for some $N+i+1 \leq l \leq N+j$. Note that the $\mathrm{sl}(n_i)$-module $F^{\nu'}_{n_i}$ for $\nu' = \mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_q$ also has non-zero multiplicity in (22) because $c^{\nu'}_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_q} \neq 0$. Since all $q_1,\ldots,q_r$ are divisible by p_l, we have $\nu' = p_l\mu'$ for some integral dominant weight μ'. Since $F^{\nu'}_{n_i}$ has non-zero multiplicity in W_j considered as an $\mathrm{sl}(n_i)$-module using the path along θ_j in (21), and since $W_j \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(m_i)$ is a direct sum of copies of W_i, it must be that $F^{\nu'}_{n_i}$ has non-zero multiplicity in $W_i \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n_i)$, i.e. $\nu' \in H_i$. Since $d_i = d < p_l - 1$ we have $p_l > \nu'_1 - \nu'_{n_i} = p_l(\mu'_1 - \mu'_{n_i})$ which possible only if $\mu'_1 = \mu'_{n_i}$ (equivalently, $\nu'_1 = \nu'_{n_i}$). Therefore ν' is a trivial highest weight, and hence all $\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_q$ are trivial as well. Then the coefficient $c^{\nu}_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_q}$ is non-zero only if ν is trivial, so $F^{\nu}_{n_i}$ is the trivial module.

Suppose now that p_l does not divide at least one of $q_1,\ldots,q_r$ for each l such that $N+i \leq l \leq N+j$. A combinatorial argument shows that $C_q^{q_1,\ldots,q_r} = \frac{q!}{q_1!\cdots q_r!}$ is divisible by q if each prime divisor of q fails to divide at least one of $q_1,\ldots,q_r$. We thus conclude that each non-trivial $\mathrm{sl}(n_i)$-module $F^{\nu}_{n_i}$ with non-zero multiplicity in (22), has multiplicity divisible by q. As a corollary, any non-trivial simple constituent of $W_j \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n_i)$ appears with multiplicity divisible by q.

By following the diagram in (21) down θ_i and then to the right, we get $W_j \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n_i) \cong \dfrac{m_j}{m_i} \displaystyle\bigoplus_{\nu \in H_i} t_{\nu,i} F^{\nu}_{n_i}$.

Since $q = (p_{N+i+1})^{l_{N+i+1}} \cdots (p_{N+j})^{l_{N+j}}$ is relatively prime to $\frac{m_j}{m_i} = (p_{N+k_i+1})^{l_{N+k_i+1}} \cdots (p_{N+k_j})^{l_{N+k_j}}$ (as $j \leq k_i$), the commutativity of the diagram in (21) implies that $t_{\nu,i}$ is divisible by q for any non-trivial ν in H_i.

Let us introduce a new notation. For an arbitrary injective homomorphism $\varphi : \mathfrak{g}_1 \to \mathfrak{g}_2$ of finite-dimensional classical simple Lie algebras of type A we denote by $N(\varphi)$ the number (counting multiplicities) of simple non-trivial constituents of the natural representation of $\mathfrak{g}_2$ considered as a $\mathfrak{g}_1$-module via φ. Then $N_i := N(\theta_i)$ is divisible by $q = (p_{N+i+1})^{l_{N+i+1}} \cdots (p_{N+j})^{l_{N+j}}$ by the above argument. Taking $j = k_i$ we obtain that N_i is divisible by $(p_{N+i+1})^{l_{N+i+1}} \cdots (p_{N+k_i})^{l_{N+k_i}}$.

Fix now $j = i+1$ in the diagram in (21), and let $\psi : \mathrm{sl}(n_i) \to \mathrm{sl}(m_{i+1})$ denote the map produced by this diagram. As shown above, each non-trivial weight $\lambda \in H_{i+1}$ yields a non-trivial weight in $H(\psi) = H_i$ with non-zero multiplicity divisible by $(p_{N+i+1})^{l_{N+i+1}}$, and hence at least $(p_{N+i+1})^{l_{N+i+1}}$. Therefore by following the diagram to the right and then down θ_{i+1}, we obtain $N(\psi) \geq (p_{N+i+1})^{l_{N+i+1}} N_{i+1}$. Note also that equality holds here only if for each non-trivial $\lambda \in H_{i+1}$ we have $F^{\lambda}_{qn_i} \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n_i) \cong qF^{\nu}_{n_i} \oplus T$ for a non-trivial $\nu \in H_i$, where T is a trivial (possibly 0-dimensional) module. Meanwhile, by following the diagram down θ_i and to the right we have $N(\psi) = (p_{N+k_i+1})^{l_{N+k_i+1}} \cdots (p_{N+k_{i+1}})^{l_{N+k_{i+1}}} N_i$. As a result we obtain the inequality $(p_{N+k_i+1})^{l_{N+k_i+1}} \cdots (p_{N+k_{i+1}})^{l_{N+k_{i+1}}} N_i \geq (p_{N+i+1})^{l_{N+i+1}} N_{i+1}$, i.e. $\alpha_i \geq \alpha_{i+1}$, where $\alpha_i := \frac{N_i}{(p_{N+i+1})^{l_{N+i+1}} \cdots (p_{N+k_i})^{l_{N+k_i}}}$ are integers for $i \geq 0$. Since $\{\alpha_i\}$ is a decreasing sequence of positive integers it stabilizes, and by choosing N sufficiently large we can assume that $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \cdots$.

Now take an arbitrary non-trivial $\lambda \in H_{i+1}$. Since $\alpha_i = \alpha_{i+1}$, the decomposition in (22) becomes $F^{\lambda}_{qn_i} \downarrow \mathrm{sl}(n_i) \cong qF^{\nu}_{n_i} \oplus T$ for some non-trivial $\nu \in H_i$, where T is some trivial (possibly 0-dimensional) module. Since the contribution from each multiset $[\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_q]$ to the multiplicity of $F^{\nu}_{n_i}$ in (22) is divisible by q, there exists exactly one multiset $[\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_q]$ making a non-zero contribution to the multiplicity of $F^{\nu}_{n_i}$. Moreover, the fact that $C^{q_1,\ldots,q_r}_{q} c^{\lambda}_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_q} c^{\nu}_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_q} = q$ together with the fact that q divides $C^{q_1,\ldots,q_r}_{q}$ implies $C^{q_1,\ldots,q_r}_{q} = q$. It is easy to check that $\frac{q!}{q_1!\cdots q_r!} = q$ only if $r = 2$ and $\{q_1, q_2\} = \{1, q-1\}$. Then we safely can assume that $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \cdots = \mu_{q-1}$. Since $\nu' = \mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_q$ is a non-trivial weight satisfying $c^{\nu'}_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_q} \neq 0$, the module $F^{\nu'}_{n_i}$ also has non-zero multiplicity in (22), and therefore $\nu = \nu'$. Hence $\nu = (q-1)\mu_1 + \mu_q$, and since $\nu_1 - \nu_{n_i} \leq d < (p_{N+i+1})^{l_{N+i+1}} - 1 = q - 1$, we immediately get that μ_1 is a trivial weight. Then the only multiset $[\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_q]$ making $c^{\lambda}_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_q}$ non-zero has $q-1$ trivial weights. One can check that this is only possible if λ is either of the form $(c+1, c, \ldots, c, c)$ or $(c, c, \ldots, c, c+1)$. Thus, all non-trivial highest weights from H_{i+1} are either those of the natural or of the conatural representation. This means precisely that all homomorphisms θ_i are diagonal. □

Corollary 3.9. *Let $\mathfrak{s}_1 = X_1(\mathcal{T}_1)$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2 = X_2(\mathcal{T}_2)$ be non-sparse Lie algebras, neither of them finitary. Set $S_i = \mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}_i)$, $S = \mathrm{GCD}(S_1, S_2)$, and $R_i = \div(S_i, S)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Assume that S is not divisible by an infinite power of any prime number, and that both R_1 and R_2 are finite. An injective homomorphism of $\mathfrak{s}_1$ into $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is necessary diagonal.*

Proof. Set $\delta_i = \delta(\mathcal{T}_i)$, $i = 1, 2$. Denote $\mathfrak{s}'_1 = \mathrm{sl}(\div(S_1, R'_1))$, where $R'_1 > 2\delta_1$ is some finite divisor of S_1, and $\mathfrak{s}'_2 = \mathrm{sl}(S_2 R'_2)$, where R'_2 is finite and $R'_2 > \frac{2}{\delta_2}$. Then, by Lemma 3.2 (i) and Lemma 3.3 (i), (ii), $\mathfrak{s}'_1$ admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}'_2$. Then there exists an injective homomorphism of $\mathfrak{s}'_1$ into $\mathfrak{s}'_2$ through the chain $\mathfrak{s}'_1 \subset \mathfrak{s}_1 \subset \mathfrak{s}_2 \subset \mathfrak{s}'_2$ and this homomorphism is diagonal because the Lie algebras $\mathfrak{s}'_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}'_2$ satisfy the conditions of Proposition 3.8. Finally, it follows from Corollary 2.11 that the injective homomorphism of $\mathfrak{s}_1$ into $\mathfrak{s}_2$ has to be diagonal as well. □

Lemma 3.10. *Let $\mathfrak{s}_1 = X_1(\mathcal{T}_1)$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2 = X(\mathcal{T}_2)$ be non-sparse Lie algebras, neither of them finitary. Set $S_i = \mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}_i)$, $S = \mathrm{GCD}(S_1, S_2)$, $R_i = \div(S_i, S)$, $\delta_i = \delta(\mathcal{T}_i)$, $C_i = \mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{C}_i)$, $C = \mathrm{GCD}(C_1, C_2)$, $B_i = \div(C_i, C)$, and $\sigma_i = \sigma(\mathcal{T}_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Assume that S is not divisible by an infinite power of any prime, and both R_1 and R_2 are finite. If $\mathfrak{s}_1$ admits a diagonal injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_2$, then the following holds.*

(i) $\frac{R_1}{\delta_1} \leq \frac{R_2}{\delta_2}$*. The inequality is strict if $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is pure and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is dense.*

(ii) $2\frac{R_1}{\delta_1} \leq \frac{R_2}{\delta_2}$ *when one of the following additional hypotheses holds:*

  - *$(X_1, X_2) = (A, C)$, (A, O), (O, C), or (C, O);*
  - *$(X_1, X_2) = (A, A)$, B_1 is infinite;*
  - *$(X_1, X_2) = (A, A)$, B_1 is finite, $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is two-sided weakly non-symmetric, $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is either one-sided or two-sided strongly non-symmetric;*
  - *$(X_1, X_2) = (A, A)$, both B_1 and B_2 are finite, C is not divisible by an infinite power of a prime number, both $\mathfrak{s}_1$, $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are two-sided strongly non-symmetric, and $\frac{R_1\sigma_1}{B_1} < \frac{R_2\sigma_2}{B_2}$.*

Again the inequality is strict if $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is pure and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is dense.

Proof. As it was explained in the proof of Lemma 3.2, we can choose suitable exhaustions of $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$.

(i) Assume that $(X_1, X_2) = (A, A)$ (the other cases are analogous). Let $\mathfrak{s}_1$ be exhausted as $\mathrm{sl}(n_0) \subset \mathrm{sl}(n_1) \subset \cdots$, each inclusion $\mathrm{sl}(n_i) \to \mathrm{sl}(n_{i+1})$ being of signature (l_i, r_i, z_i), $i \geq 0$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ as $\mathrm{sl}(m_0) \subset \mathrm{sl}(m_1) \subset \cdots$ with $\mathrm{sl}(m_i) \to \mathrm{sl}(m_{i+1})$ being of signature (l'_i, r'_i, z'_i), $i \geq 0$. Moreover, we choose n_0 to be divisible by R_1 and m_0 to be divisible by R_2.

There is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{sl}(n_0) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_0"'] & \mathrm{sl}(n_1) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_1"'] & \cdots \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(n_i) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\theta_i"'] & \cdots \\
\mathrm{sl}(m_{k_0}) \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(m_{k_1}) \arrow[r] & \cdots \arrow[r] & \mathrm{sl}(m_{k_i}) \arrow[r] & \cdots,
\end{tikzcd} \tag{23}$$

where each injective homomorphism θ_i is diagonal of signature $(x_i, y_i, m_{k_i} - (x_i + y_i)n_i)$. Denote $q_i = x_i + y_i$. Then, using Corollary 2.5 [BZ], we get

$$q_i s'_{k_i} \cdots s'_{k_j - 1} = s_i \cdots s_{j-1} q_j \text{ for all } j > i \geq 0. \tag{24}$$

Hence $s_i s_{i+1} \cdots$ divides $q_i s'_{k_i} s'_{k_i+1} \cdots$ for $i \geq 0$, so $S_1 m_0 s'_0 \cdots s'_{k_i - 1}$ divides $q_i S_2 n_0 s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}$. Since S is not divisible by an infinite power of any prime number, the first Steinitz number will still divide the second one after cancellation of both of them by S. Therefore $\div(q_i R_2 n_0 s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}, R_1 m_0 s'_0 \cdots s'_{k_i - 1})$ is a Steinitz number which is moreover finite, and thus it is a positive integer. So $\frac{m_0 s'_0 \cdots s'_{k_i-1}}{R_2 m_{k_i}} \leq \frac{n_0 s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}}{R_1 n_i}$. Taking the limit of both sides for $i \to \infty$ we get $\frac{\delta_2}{R_2} \leq \frac{\delta_1}{R_1}$. Moreover, if $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is pure and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is dense, then $\frac{m_0 s'_0 \cdots s'_{k_i-1}}{R_2 m_{k_i}} \leq \frac{\delta_1}{R_1}$ for large enough i. But the decreasing sequence $\frac{m_0 s'_0 \cdots s'_{k_i-1}}{m_{k_i}}$ does not stabilize, so we obtain the strict inequality $\frac{\delta_2}{R_2} < \frac{\delta_1}{R_1}$.

(ii) We keep the notations from (i). The injective homomorphism of $\mathfrak{s}_1$ into $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is given again by (23). If the pair (X_1, X_2) is one of (A, C), (A, O), (O, C), and (C, O), then, by Proposition 2.3 [BZ], for any diagonal injective homomorphism of a type X_1 algebra into a type X_2 algebra of signature (l, r, z) the integer $l + r$ is even. Therefore q_j is divisible by 2 for any j and it follows from (24) that $q_i s'_{k_i} s'_{k_i+1} \cdots$ is divisible by $2 s_i s_{i+1} \cdots$. The rest of the proof is analogous to (i).

In the other three cases both $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are of type A. Notice that neither $\mathfrak{s}_1$ nor $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is two-sided symmetric (otherwise S would be divisible by 2^∞). Thus we can assume that $c_i > 0$ and $c'_i > 0$ for all $i \geq 0$. Denote $t_i = x_i - y_i$. It is enough to prove that $t_i = 0$ for infinitely many i (because then q_i is even for infinitely many i and the statement can be proven similarly to the first case). Assume the contrary, i.e. let $t_i > 0$ for $i \geq i_0$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $t_i > 0$ for all $i \geq 0$. Let us show that this contradicts with the assumptions of the lemma in all three cases.

Let B_1 be infinite. By Corollary 2.5 in [BZ],

$$t_0 c'_{k_0} \cdots c'_{k_i - 1} = c_0 \cdots c_{i-1} t_i \text{ for } i \geq 1. \tag{25}$$

Then clearly $c_0 c_1 \cdots$ divides $t_0 c'_{k_0} c'_{k_0+1} \cdots$, and therefore B_1 divides $n_0 t_0$. This contradicts B_1 being infinite.

For the next case, combining (24) and (25), we obtain $\frac{t_0}{q_0} \cdot \frac{c'_{k_0} \cdots c'_{k_i-1}}{s'_{k_0} \cdots s'_{k_i-1}} = \frac{t_i}{q_i} \cdot \frac{c_0 \cdots c_{i-1}}{s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}}$. By definition $\sigma_1 = \lim\limits_{i\to\infty} \dfrac{c_0 \cdots c_i}{s_0 \cdots s_i}$, and since $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is two-sided weakly non-symmetric we have $\lim\limits_{i\to\infty} \dfrac{t_i}{q_i} \dfrac{c_0 \cdots c_i}{s_0 \cdots s_i} = 0$. But $\lim\limits_{i\to\infty} \dfrac{t_0}{q_0} \cdot \dfrac{c'_{k_0} \cdots c'_{k_i-1}}{s'_{k_0} \cdots s'_{k_i-1}} = u\sigma_2$, where $u = \frac{t_0 s'_0 \cdots s'_{k_0-1}}{q_0 c'_0 \cdots c'_{k_0-1}} > 0$. So $\sigma_2 = 0$, contradicting $\mathfrak{s}_2$ being not two-sided weakly non-symmetric.

Finally, let both $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ be two-sided strongly non-symmetric. Since $t_i \leq q_i$ for $i \geq 0$, we have $\frac{t_0}{q_0} \cdot \frac{c'_{k_0} \cdots c'_{k_i-1}}{s'_{k_0} \cdots s'_{k_i-1}} \leq \frac{c_0 \cdots c_{i-1}}{s_0 \cdots s_{i-1}}$. Taking the limit we obtain

$$\frac{t_0}{q_0} \cdot \frac{s'_0 \cdots s'_{k_0-1}}{c'_0 \cdots c'_{k_0-1}} \sigma_2 \leq \sigma_1. \tag{26}$$

Let us go back to (24). We know that $q_0 s'_{k_0} \cdots s'_{k_i-1} = s_0 \cdots s_{i-1} q_i$. If q_i is divisible by some prime number p for infinitely many i, then by an argument similar to that in (i) one derives the inequality $p \frac{R_1}{\delta_1} \leq \frac{R_2}{\delta_2}$, from which the statement follows. So we can assume that every p divides at most finitely many q_i. Then it is easy to see that the Steinitz numbers $q_0 s'_{k_0} s'_{k_0+1} \cdots$ and $s_0 s_1 \cdots$ have equal values at every prime p, so they coincide. Hence,

$$\frac{R_2}{R_1} = \frac{m_0 s'_0 \cdots s'_{k_0-1}}{q_0 n_0}. \tag{27}$$

From (25) $c_0 c_1 \cdots$ divides $t_0 c'_{k_0} c'_{k_0+1} \cdots$, and therefore $\frac{B_2}{B_1} \geq \frac{m_0 c'_0 \cdots c'_{k_0-1}}{t_0 n_0}$. Combining the latter inequality with (26) and (27) we obtain $\frac{\sigma_1}{\sigma_2} \geq \frac{R_2 B_1}{R_1 B_2}$, which contradicts an assumption in the statement of the lemma. ☐

We are now able to prove the main result of the paper.

Theorem 3.11. *a) The three finitary Lie algebras* sl(∞), so(∞), sp(∞) *admit an injective homomorphism into any infinite-dimensional diagonal Lie algebra. An infinite-dimensional non-finitary diagonal Lie algebra admits no injective homomorphism into* sl(∞), so(∞), sp(∞).

b) Let $\mathfrak{s}_1 = X_1(\mathcal{T}_1)$, $\mathfrak{s}_2 = X_2(\mathcal{T}_2)$ be infinite-dimensional non-finitary diagonal Lie algebras. Set $S_i = \mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}_i)$, $S = \mathrm{GCD}(S_1, S_2)$, $R_i = \div(S_i, S)$, $\delta_i = \delta(\mathcal{T}_i)$, $C_i = \mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{C}_i)$, $C = \mathrm{GCD}(C_1, C_2)$, $B_i = \div(C_i, C)$, and $\sigma_i = \sigma(\mathcal{T}_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then $\mathfrak{s}_1$ admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}_2$ if and only if the following conditions hold.

1) R_1 is finite.

2) $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is sparse if $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is sparse.

3) If $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are non-sparse, both R_1 and R_2 are finite, and S is not divisible by an infinite power of any prime number, then $\epsilon\frac{R_1}{\delta_1} \leq \frac{R_2}{\delta_2}$ for ϵ as specified below. The inequality is strict if $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is pure and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is dense. We have $\epsilon = 2$, except in the cases listed below, in which $\epsilon = 1$:

3.1) $(X_1, X_2) = (C, C)$, (O, O), (C, A), (O, A), and $(X_1, X_2) = (A, A)$ with both $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ being one-sided;

3.2) $(X_1, X_2) = (A, A)$, B_1 is finite, either $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is one-sided and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is two-sided non-symmetric or $\mathfrak{s}_2$ is two-sided weakly non-symmetric and $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is two-sided non-symmetric;

3.3) $(X_1, X_2) = (A, A)$, B_1 is finite, both $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are two-sided strongly non-symmetric, either B_2 is infinite or C is divisible by an infinite power of any prime number;

3.4) $(X_1, X_2) = (A, A)$, both B_1 and B_2 are finite, both $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are two-sided strongly non-symmetric, C is not divisible by an infinite power of any prime number, and $\frac{R_1\sigma_1}{B_1} \geq \frac{R_2\sigma_2}{B_2}$.

Proof. a) The statement follows directly from Corollary 3.4 and Proposition 3.5.

b) The sufficiency of the conditions follows directly from Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3.

The necessity of conditions 1 and 2 follows from Proposition 3.5 and Corollary 3.7 respectively. Let us prove the necessity of condition 3. Note that the assumptions of this condition satisfy Corollary 3.9. Hence in this case an injective homomorphism of $\mathfrak{s}_1$ into $\mathfrak{s}_2$, if it exists, has to be diagonal. Therefore we can apply Lemma 3.10 and this lemma implies the necessity of condition 3 (it is easy to check that under corresponding assumptions the cases which are not listed in 3.1–3.4 are exactly the cases listed in Lemma 3.10 (ii)). ☐

The following corollary gives a description of equivalence classes of diagonal Lie algebras with respect to the equivalence relation introduced earlier in this paper.

Corollary 3.12. *a) The three finitary Lie algebras* $\mathrm{sl}(\infty)$, $\mathrm{so}(\infty)$, *and* $\mathrm{sp}(\infty)$ *are pairwise equivalent. None of them is equivalent to any non-finitary diagonal Lie algebra.*

b) Let $\mathfrak{s}_1 = X_1(\mathcal{T}_1)$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2 = X_2(\mathcal{T}_2)$ be infinite-dimensional non-finitary diagonal Lie algebras. Set $S_i = \mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}_i)$, $S = \mathrm{GCD}(S_1, S_2)$, $R_i = \div(S_i, S)$, $\delta_i = \delta(\mathcal{T}_i)$, $C_i = \mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{C}_i)$, $C = \mathrm{GCD}(C_1, C_2)$, $B_i = \div(C_i, C)$, and $\sigma_i = \sigma(\mathcal{T}_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then $\mathfrak{s}_1$ is equivalent to $\mathfrak{s}_2$ if and only if the following conditions hold.

1) $S_1 \overset{\mathbb{Q}}{\sim} S_2$.

2) Both $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are either sparse or non-sparse.

3) If $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are non-sparse and S is not divisible by an infinite power of any prime number, then:

3.1) $\frac{R_1}{\delta_1} = \frac{R_2}{\delta_2}$;

3.2) $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ have the same density type;

3.3) $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are of the same type ($X_1 = X_2$);

3.4) $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ have the same symmetry type;

3.5) $C_1 \overset{\mathbb{Q}}{\sim} C_2$ if $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are two-sided non-symmetric;

3.6) $\frac{R_1\sigma_1}{B_1} = \frac{R_2\sigma_2}{B_2}$ if $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are two-sided strongly non-symmetric and C is not divisible by an infinite power of any prime number.

Proof. a) The statement follows directly from Theorem 3.11 a).

b) To prove sufficiency it is easy to check case by case that all the conditions of Theorem 3.11 b) are satisfied for both pairs $\mathfrak{s}_1 \subset \mathfrak{s}_2$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2 \subset \mathfrak{s}_1$.

Let us prove necessity. Assume that there exist injective homomorphisms $\mathfrak{s}_1 \to \mathfrak{s}_2$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2 \to \mathfrak{s}_1$. Conditions 1 and 2 are obviously satisfied. Suppose that $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ are both non-sparse and S is not divisible by an infinite power of any prime number. Then $\epsilon_1\frac{R_1}{\delta_1} \leq \frac{R_2}{\delta_2}$ and $\epsilon_2\frac{R_2}{\delta_2} \leq \frac{R_1}{\delta_1}$ by Theorem 3.11 b). Clearly, this is only possible if $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 1$ and $\frac{R_1}{\delta_1} = \frac{R_2}{\delta_2}$. Then $\mathfrak{s}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_2$ have the same density type (otherwise one of the inequalities would be strict). Conditions 3.3–3.6 follow from conditions 3.1–3.4 of Theorem 3.11 b) for both pairs $(\mathfrak{s}_1, \mathfrak{s}_2)$ and $(\mathfrak{s}_2, \mathfrak{s}_1)$. ☐

Remark. Isomorphic Lie algebras are clearly equivalent. If two Lie algebras satisfy Theorem 2.4 (or Theorem 2.5), then they satisfy also Corollary 3.12. One can check that conditions $\mathcal{A}_3$ and $\mathcal{B}_3$ of Theorem 2.4 correspond respectively to conditions 3.1 and 3.6 of Corollary 3.12.

Let $\mathbb{D}$ denote the set of equivalence classes of infinite-dimensional diagonal Lie algebras. If we write $\mathfrak{s}_1 \to \mathfrak{s}_2$ in case there exists an injective homomorphism from $\mathfrak{s}_1$ into $\mathfrak{s}_2$, then the relation $\to$ is a partial order on $\mathbb{D}$. It follows from Theorem 3.11 a) that $\mathbb{D}$ has the only minimal element (which also is the least element) with respect to the order $\to$: the equivalence class consisting of the three finitary Lie algebras $\mathrm{sl}(\infty)$, $\mathrm{so}(\infty)$, $\mathrm{sp}(\infty)$. The following statement shows that there exist precisely one maximal element of $\mathbb{D}$ (which also is the greatest element).

Corollary 3.13. *Let $\mathfrak{s} = X(\mathcal{T})$ be a diagonal Lie algebra. Set $S = \mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S})$. The following are equivalent.*

1) Any diagonal Lie algebra admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}$.

2) $\mathfrak{s}$ is sparse and $S = p_1^\infty p_2^\infty \cdots$, where $p_1, p_2, \ldots$ is the increasing sequence of all prime numbers.

Proof. 1)⇒2): Consider a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{s}' = A(\mathcal{T}')$, where $\mathcal{T}'$ is sparse and $\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}') = p_1^\infty p_2^\infty \cdots$. Since $\mathfrak{s}'$ admits an injective homomorphism into $\mathfrak{s}$, the Steinitz number $\div(p_1^\infty p_2^\infty \cdots, S)$ is finite and $\mathfrak{s}$ is sparse by Theorem 3.11 b). Then clearly $S = p_1^\infty p_2^\infty \cdots$.

2)⇒1): It follows immediately from Theorem 3.11. ☐

The equivalence class corresponding to the maximal element of $\mathbb{D}$ consists of infinitely many pairwise non-isomorphic Lie algebras. Indeed, by Theorem 2.4 there is only one, up to isomorphism, sparse one-sided Lie algebra of type A satisfying property 2 of Corollary 3.13, but there are infinitely many sparse two-sided Lie algebras of type A with this property. By Theorem 2.5, any Lie algebra of type other than A satisfying property 2 of Corollary 3.13 is isomorphic to the sparse two-sided symmetric Lie algebra of type A with $\mathrm{Stz}(\mathcal{S}) = p_1^\infty p_2^\infty \cdots$.

4 Acknowledgements

I want to express my gratitude to my thesis adviser Ivan Penkov for sharing his many ideas with me. This project would never have been without his guidance and support. I also thank Elizabeth Dan-Cohen and Ivan Penkov for their invaluable assistance in the writing of this text.

References

[B1] A. A. Baranov, Diagonal locally finite Lie algebras and a version of Ado's theorem, J. Algebra **199** (1998), 1-39.

[B2] A. A. Baranov, Simple diagonal locally finite Lie algebras, Proc. London Math. Soc. **77** (1998), 362-386.

[B3] A. A. Baranov, Complex finitary simple Lie algebras, Arch. Math. **71** (1998), 1-6.

[B4] A. A. Baranov, Finitary simple Lie algebras, J. Algebra **219** (1999), 299-329.

[BS] A. A. Baranov, H. Strade, Finitary Lie algebras, J. Algebra **254** (2002), 173-211.

[BZ] A. A. Baranov, A. G. Zhilinskii, Diagonal direct limits of simple Lie algebras, Comm. Algebra **27** (1998), 2749-2766.

[D] E. B. Dynkin, Semisimple subalgebras of semisimple Lie algebras, Mat. Sbornik **2** (1972), 349-462 (Russian).

[DP] I. Dimitrov, I. Penkov, Locally semisimple and maximal subalgebras of the finatary Lie algebras $\mathrm{gl}(\infty)$, $\mathrm{sl}(\infty)$, $\mathrm{so}(\infty)$, and $\mathrm{sp}(\infty)$, J. Algebra **322** (2009), 2069-2081.

[HTW] Roger Howe, Eng-Chye Tan, Jeb F. Willenbring, Stable branching rules for classical symmetric pairs, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **357** (2005), 1601-1626.

[M] A. I. Malcev, On semisimple subgroups of Lie groups, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **8** (1944), 143-174 (Russian).

[Z] D. P. Zhelobenko, Representations of reductive Lie algebras, Nauka, Moscow 1994 (Russian).